MACMILLAN

An Advanced History of India



Fourth Edition with an Appendix on Bangladesh

R C MAJUMDAR
H C RAYCHAUDHURI
KALIKINKAR DATTA

AN ADVANCED HISTORY OF INDIA

AN ADVANCED HISTORY OF INDIA

BY

R. C. MAJUMDAR, M.A., Ph.D.
Formerly Vice-Chancellor, Dacca University

H. C. RAYCHAUDHURI, M.A., Ph.D.
Sometime Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University

KALIKINKAR DATTA, M.A., Ph.D.
Sometime Vice-Chancellor, Patna University, and Professor of History, Patna University

FOURTH EDITION

MACMILLAN

© Preface to Third Edition, new material in Appendix II, Appendix III, and Index: R.C. Majumdar and Kalikinkar Datta, 1967 © Appendix IV: R.C. Majumdar and Kalikinkar Datta, 1973 © All additional material for the Fourth Edition: Kalikinkar Datta, 1978

This book is copyright in all countries which are signatories to the Berne Convention. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without permission

Under arrangement with
MACMILLAN AND COMPANY LIMITED
London and Basingstoke

First Published 1946 Reprinted (twice); Second Edition 1950 Reprinted Seven times; Third Edition 1967 Reprinted five times; Fourth Edition 1978 Reprinted 1980-2008(Twenty Five Impressions),2009(twice). ***2010,***

MACMILLAN PUBLISHERS INDIA LIMITED
Delhi Bangalore Chennai Kolkata Mumbai
Ahmedabad Bhopal Chandigarh Coimbatore Cuttack
Guwahati Hubli Hyderabad Jaipur Lucknow Madurai
Nagpur Patna Pune Thiruvananthapuram Visakhapatnam

Companies and representatives throughout the world

ISBN 10: 0333-90298-0
ISBN 13: 978-0333-90298-1

Published by Rajiv Beri for **Macmillan Publishers India Limited**
2/10 Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi 110 002

Printed by S. M. YOGAN at Macmillan India Press, Chennai 600 041

This book is meant for educational and learning purposes. The author(s) of the book has/have taken all reasonable care to ensure that the contents of the book do not violate any existing copyright or other intellectual property rights of any person in any manner whatsoever. In the event the author(s) has/have been unable to track any source and if any copyright has been inadvertently infringed, please notify the publisher in writing for corrective action.

CONTENTS

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION . . . . *page* ix
PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION x
PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION xii
PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION xiii
LIST OF MAPS xiv

PART I[1]

ANCIENT INDIA

I. PHYSICAL ASPECTS AND UNDERLYING UNITY . . 3
II. THE PRE-HISTORIC PERIOD 9
III. THE EARLY VEDIC AGE 24
IV. LATER VEDIC CIVILISATION 39
V. THE BEGINNINGS OF MAGADHAN ASCENDANCY AND THE COMING OF THE YAVANAS 53
VI. CIVILISATION IN THE EARLY DAYS OF MAGADHAN ASCENDANCY 67
VII. THE MAURYA EMPIRE 91
VIII. THE DISRUPTION OF THE MAGADHAN EMPIRE AND INCURSIONS FROM CENTRAL ASIA AND IRĀN . . 107
IX. CIVILISATION IN THE EAR OF MAURYAN IMPERIALISM AND OF GRAECO-SCYTHIAN INVASIONS (*c.* 324 B.C.—A.D. 320) 117
X. THE GUPTA EMPIRE 137
XI. THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE HUNS, AND THE ASCENDANCY OF KANAUJ, KĀSHMĪR AND GAUḌA . . 146
XII. THE DECCAN FROM THE FALL OF THE SĀTAVĀHANAS TO THE END OF RĀSHṬRAKŪTA SUPREMACY—RISE OF THE EMPIRES OF KĀÑCHĪ AND KARṆĀṬA . . 164
XIII. THE PASSING OF THE OLD HINDU KINGDOMS . . 171
XIV. INDIAN CIVILISATION UNDER THE IMPERIAL GUPTAS AND THEIR SUCCESSORS 184

[1]Part I, Chapters I, and III–XIV, are by Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri; Chapters II, XV and XVI by Dr. R. C. Majumdar.

XV. COLONIAL AND CULTURAL EXPANSION . . . 202
XVI. MONUMENTS OF ANCIENT INDIA 217
GENEALOGICAL TABLES TO PART I 248
BIBLIOGRAPHY TO PART I 257

PART II

MEDIEVAL INDIA

Book I[1]

THE MUSLIM CONQUEST AND THE DELHI SULTĀNATE

I. THE ADVENT OF THE MUSLIMS 267
II. THE SO-CALLED SLAVE DYNASTY AND THE CONSOLIDATION OF MUSLIM POWER IN NORTHERN INDIA . . 273
III. THE KHALJĪS AND THE EXPANSION OF THE SULTĀNATE TO THE SOUTH 288
IV. THE HOUSE OF TUGHLUQ AND THE BEGINNING OF DISRUPTION 306
V. DISINTEGRATION OF THE DELHI SULTĀNATE . . 330
VI. THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TURKO-AFGHĀNS IN INDIA, AND MORAL AS WELL AS MATERIAL CONDITIONS OF THE COUNTRY DURING THEIR RULE . . . 384

Book II[2]

THE MUGHUL EMPIRE

I. MUGHUL-AFGHĀN CONTEST FOR SUPREMACY IN INDIA, A.D. 1526–1556 418
II. AKBAR THE GREAT 440
III. JAHĀNGĪR AND SHĀH JAHĀN 456
IV. AURANGZEB ʿĀLAMGĪR (1658–1707) . . . 484
V. DISINTEGRATION OF THE MUGHUL EMPIRE . . . 520

[1]Book I, Chapter I, is by Dr. R. C. Majumdar; and Chapters II–VI by Dr. Kalikinkar Datta.

[2]Book II is by Dr. Kalikinkar Datta.

VI. MUGHUL ADMINISTRATION 547
VII. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE 559
VIII. EDUCATION, LITERATURE AND ART 571
GENEALOGICAL TABLES TO PART II 595
BIBLIOGRAPHY TO PART II 609

PART III

MODERN INDIA

Book I[1]

THE RISE AND GROWTH OF THE BRITISH POWER

I. ADVENT OF THE EUROPEANS 623
II. RISE OF THE BRITISH POWER, 1740-1765 . . . 637
III. GROWTH OF THE BRITISH POWER, 1765-1798 . . 668
IV. ESTABLISHMENT OF BRITISH ASCENDANCY, 1798-1823 691
V. EXPANSION OF THE BRITISH DOMINION BEYOND THE BRAHMAPUTRA AND THE SUTLEJ, 1824–1856 . . 722
VI. THE COMPANY AND THE MINOR INDIAN STATES (1774-1858) 757
VII. THE INDIAN REVOLT OF 1857–59 765
VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANISATION UP TO THE REVOLT . 777
IX. TRADE AND INDUSTRY, 1757–1857 799
X. THE DAWN OF NEW INDIA 806

Book II[2]

MODERN INDIA

I. POLITICAL RELATIONS, 1858–1905 823
II. WHITEHALL AND THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA (1858-1905) 840

[1]Book I, Chapters II, VIII–X are by Dr. R. C. Majumdar; and Chapters I and III–VII by Dr. Kalikinkar Datta.

[2]Book II, Chapters I-IV and IX are by Dr. R. C. Majumdar; and Chapters V–VIII and Appendix I by Dr. Kalikinkar Datta.

III.	INTERNAL ADMINISTRATION, 1858–1905	847
IV.	THE GROWTH OF NEW INDIA, 1858–1905	867
V.	POLITICAL RELATIONS, 1906–1937	890
VI.	CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES, 1906–1937	899
VII.	INTERNAL ADMINISTRATICN AND GENERAL CONDITION, 1906–1938	914
VIII.	INDIA DURING AND AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR	949
IX.	THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM	967
	APPENDIX I: THE INDIAN STATES IN NEW INDIA	982
	APPENDIX II: THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA	991
	APPENDIX III: FOREIGN AGGRESSIONS	1006
	APPENDIX IV: THE EMERGENCE OF BANGLADESH	1010
	APPENDIX V: RECENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHANGES	1019
	APPENDIX VI: FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH OTHER POWERS	1023
	GENEALOGICAL TABLES TO PART III	1030
	BIBLIOGRAPHY TO PART III	1039
	LIST OF GOVERNORS-GENERAL	1062
	LIST OF PRIMEMINISTERS AND PRESIDENTS	1065
	CHRONOLOGY	1067
	INDEX	1095

PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION

THE revised fourth edition details events right up to 1978 and includes lists of Presidents and Prime Ministers of India, Bangladesh and Pakistan till 1977–78. It discusses recent Constitutional Amendments, socio-economic changes and educational experiments. India's relations with the U.S.A., the Soviet Union, China, the Arab states, Afghanistan, Pakistan and Bangladesh have been critically reviewed. Finally, India's role as a champion of international amity and peace has been clearly outlined.

K. K. D.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

THE chequered annals of our ancient land have been the theme of many a writer of the East as well as the West. If a fresh attempt is now made to recite the *itihāsa purātana* it is due in large measure to the accumulation of new stocks of information which every year are yielded to the spade of the archæologist and the patient industry of the scholar. It is also due in part to the teaching of experience which suggests the need, with fresh data at our disposal, of viewing things from a different angle of vision.

The book which is now published is primarily intended to meet the requirements of advanced students who have already an acquaintance with the broad outlines of the subject. It has been the endeavour of the authors to place before them in the course of the narrative such details about the salient features of Indian History in the different periods of its evolution as may be fitted into the framework of the story provided for them at the earlier stages of their educational career. In doing this a special stress has been laid on administrative, social, economic, and cultural aspects, which do not always receive in studies of this kind the attention that is their due. A prominent place has also been given to such important topics as the colonial and cultural expansion of the ancient Hindus, the evolution of different types of art and architecture, and the growth of a new India as a result of the impact of different civilisations in recent times.

The history of the latest periods has been written on a somewhat novel plan. Instead of dealing separately with the brief rule of each succeeding Governor-General, an attempt has been made to treat in their logical sequence such absorbing subjects as the rise and growth of a remote island people as a political power in our country, the different phases of constitutional and administrative changes, and the social, religious, and economic conditions during well-defined periods. In other words, in treating the events of the modern age, attention has in the main been focused not so much on personalities as on movements and courses of policy. This method may involve some loss of dramatic interest but has the merit of tracing clearly the main threads of history in a given epoch

We have tried to make the details as accurate and authentic as possible in the light of the latest researches, and where no definite conclusion is possible we have sought to indicate the different view-points in a detached spirit. An attempt has been made to add flesh and blood to the dry skeleton of history, particularly that of the earlier periods, with the help of such materials as may be gleaned from a close scrutiny of the original sources. The maps, select bibliographies, and genealogical and chronological tables, will, it is hoped, be of some use to earnest investigators. We need not dilate upon other special features of the book which cannot be missed by anyone who examines it.

A joint literary production, in spite of its obvious advantages, is not unlikely to suffer from some serious defects. The authors sought to minimise these as far as possible by periodical discussions and scrutiny of the contents of each chapter. Whether, and how far, they have been able to avoid the imperfections that are apt to occur in a work of this kind, it is for others to judge Apart from this, some defects may be attributed to the printing of the book in Great Britain at a time when communication between the authors and the publishers was rendered more and more difficult by circumstances over which they had no control. All these shortcomings may, we hope, be largely removed in future editions of the work. In the meantime we can only crave the indulgence of our readers for such errors of omission and commission as they may detect in the following pages.

In writing Oriental names and expressions we have adopted in a general way the method of transliteration which has been followed in standard works like the *Cambridge History of India*.

We take this opportunity of expressing our deep obligation to the *pūrva sūris* and to various individuals and associations who have lent us illustrations, etc., belonging to them, with permission to make photographic reproductions. Our special thanks are due to the representatives of the publishers for the keen interest they have taken in the progress of the work. If the book now offered to students helps in some measure to prepare the ground for a fuller and clearer view of the "broadening stream" of our country's history, the labour of the authors will be amply repaid.

R. C. Majumdar
H. C. Raychaudhuri
Kalikinkar Datta

Calcutta

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

POLITICAL changes of a momentous character have taken place in India since the first publication of this volume. The most important of these is the abdication of power and authority in India by the British, with the grant of virtual independence to the Dominions of India and Pakistan. It has therefore been thought desirable to bring this history up to August 15, 1947, when power was actually transferred to the hands of the Indians. Although in general this revised edition does not go beyond that date and does not even refer to such notable events as the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi, nevertheless passing allusion has occasionally been made to later happenings in order to make the treatment of some non-controversial topics up-to-date.

The recent integration of Indian States into different Unions took place after August 15, 1947, but the readjustment of the boundaries of these states has so completely changed the political geography of modern India that it would be unwise to ignore it in a text-book of Indian History. We have accordingly dealt with this matter in an Appendix.

A second Appendix gives a summary of the new Constitution of India which came into force on January 26, 1950.

A new chapter has been added to describe India's struggle for independence, and the accounts of constitutional changes in 1935 have been somewhat abridged. The whole book has been thoroughly revised in order to correct errors and incorporate the results of the latest researches.

The appreciation of this book by the press and the public has exceeded our greatest expectations, and we have spared no pains to make it still more useful by means of the new material added to this edition.

R. C. M.
H. C. R. C.
K. K. D.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

THE book has been thoroughly revised and brought up to date by incorporating in this new edition results of the latest researches in Indian history. Although we have adhered to the old decision of narrating the history of India from the earliest time to the achievement of independence in 1947, we have added a few notes on some important events by modifying Appendix II and adding a new Appendix III. The new Appendix II brings the amendments to the Indian Constitution up to date, and the Appendix III refers to the aggressions of China and Pakistan. The Appendix III is not intended to be a full and critical narrative of the wars with China and Pakistan, but simply a recital of the chief events in these two episodes which vitally affect the future of India.

The appreciation of this book by the press and the public had exceeded our greatest expectations, and we have spared no pains to make it still more useful by means of the new material added to this edition.

January 1967

R. C. M.
K. K. D.

LIST OF MAPS

Ancient India (Bharata-Varsha)		48
Early Mediaeval India		176
Ancient Asia		208
India (Turko-Afghān Period)		285
Mughul India		482
India (Decline of the Mughul Empire)		518
Mediaeval India and the West	*facing page*	623
Battle of Plassey		655
Lord Lake's Campaigns		696
Partition of Mysore		706

The illustrations on pages
245, 371, 378, 404, 405, 406, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588
have been reproduced through the kind courtesy of the Archaeological Survey of India

PART I

ANCIENT INDIA

part of a larger unit called *Jambu-dvīpa* which was considered to be the innermost of seven concentric island-continents into which the earth, as conceived by Hindu cosmographers, was supposed to have been divided. The Purāṇic account of these insular continents contains a good deal of what is fanciful, but early Buddhist evidence suggests that *Jambu-dvīpa* was a territorial designation actually in use from the third century B.C. at the latest, and was applied to that part of Asia, outside China, throughout which the prowess of the great imperial family of the Mauryas made itself felt. The name "India" was applied to the country by the Greeks. It corresponds to the "Hi(n)du" of the old Persian epigraphs. Like "*Sapta sindhavah*" and "*Hapta Hindu*"—the appellations of the country of the Aryans in the *Veda* and the *Vendidad*—it is derived from the Sindhu (the Indus), the great river which constitutes the most imposing feature of that part of the sub-continent which seems to have been the cradle of its earliest known civilisation. Closely connected with "*Hindu*" are the later designations "*Hind*" and "*Hindusthān*" as found in the pages of mediaeval writers.

India proper, excluding its outlying dependencies, is divided primarily into four distinct regions, viz., (1) the hill country of the north, styled *Parvatāśrayin* in the Purāṇas, stretching from the swampy jungles of the Tarai to the crest of the Himālayas and affording space for the upland territories of Kāshmīr, Kangra, Tehri, Kumāun, Nepāl, Sikkim and Bhutān; (2) the great northern plain embracing the flat wheat-producing valleys of the Indus and its tributaries, the sandy deserts of Sind and Rājputāna as well as the fertile tracts watered by the Ganges, the Jumnā and the Brahmaputra; (3) the plateau of South Central India and the Deccan stretching south of the Gangetic plain and shut in from the rest of the peninsula by the main range of the Pāripātra, roughly the Western Vindhyas, the Vindhyas proper, the Sahyādri or the Western Ghāts and the Mahendra or the Eastern Ghāts; and (4) the long and narrow maritime plains of the south extending from the Ghāts to the sea and containing the rich ports of the Koṅkān and Mālabār, as well as the fertile deltas of the Godāvarī, the Kṛishṇā and the Kāverī.

These territorial compartments marked by the hand of nature do not exactly coincide with the traditional divisions of the country known to antiquity. In ancient literature we have reference to a fivefold division of India. In the centre of the Indo-Gangetic plain was the *Madhya-deśa* stretching, according to the Brāhmanical accounts, from the river Sarasvatī, which flowed past Thānesar and Pehoa (ancient Prithūdaka), to Allahābād and Benares, and,

according to the early records of the Buddhists, to the Rājmahal Hills. The western part of this area was known as the *Brahmarshi-deśa*, and the entire region was roughly equivalent to *Āryāvarta* as described in the grammar of Patañjali. But the denotation of the latter term is wider in some law-books which take it to mean the whole of the vast territory lying between the Himālayas and the Vindhyas and extending from sea to sea. To the north of the *Madhya-dėsa*, beyond Pehoa, lay *Uttarāpatha* or *Udīchya* (North-west India), to its west *Aparānta* or *Pratīchya* (Western India), to its south *Dakshiṇāpatha* or the Deccan, and to its east *Pūrva-deśa* or *Prāchya*, the Prasii of Alexander's historians. The term *Uttarāpatha* was at times applied to the whole of Northern India, and *Dakshiṇāpatha* was in some ancient works restricted to the upper Deccan north of the Kṛishṇā, the far south being termed *Tamilakam* or the Tamil country, while *Pūrva-deśa* in early times included the eastern part of the "middle region" beyond the *Antarvedī* or the Gangetic Doāb. To the five primary divisions the Purāṇas sometimes add two others, viz., the *Parvatāśrayin* or Himālayan tract, and the Vindhyan region.

The course of Indian history, like that of other countries in the world, is in large measure determined by its geography. Each of the territorial units into which the hand of nature divides the country has a distinct story of its own. The intersection of the land by deep rivers and winding chains flanked by sandy deserts or impenetrable forests, fostered a spirit of isolation and cleft the country asunder into small political and even social units, whose divergences were accentuated by the infinite variety of local conditions. Tendencies towards union and coalescence are most marked only in the vast riparian plain of the north and the extensive plateau in the interior of the peninsula, enriched and regenerated by the life-giving streams that flow from the heights of the Himālayas and the Western Ghāts. The stupendous mountain chain which fences this country off from the rest of Asia, while it constituted India a world by itself and favoured the growth of a distinct type of civilisation, never sufficed to shelter the sunny realms of the Indus and the Ganges from the inroads of ambitious potentates or wandering nomads. These invaders stormed one after another through the narrow defiles that break through the great rocky barrier and lead into the plains of the interior. The long coast studded with wealthy ports "lay open to the barks of" intrepid buccaneers and adventurers from far-off climes.

The mountain passes and the sea, however, were not mere

gates of invasion and conquest. They fostered also a more pacific intercourse with the outside world. They brought to this country the pious pilgrim and the peaceful trader and constituted highways for the diffusion of Indian culture and civilisation throughout the greater part of the Asiatic continent as well as the islands that lie off the coast of Coromandel and the peninsula of Malaya.

The size of India is enormous. The country is almost as large as the whole of the continent of Europe without Russia, and is almost twenty times as big as Great Britain. Even more remarkable than the immensity of its area is the extreme diversity of its physical features. India embraces within its boundaries lofty mountains steeped in eternal snow, as well as flat plains "salted by every tide", arid deserts almost untouched by the feet of man, as well as fertile river valleys supporting a population of over three thousand persons to the square mile. The greater part of this sub-continent had been knit into one political unit in the nineteenth century. But from August 15, 1947, two self-governing Dominions were carved out of it, known respectively as India and Pakistan, which form parts of the British Commonwealth. There are, however, certain areas, e.g. Nepāl and Bhutān, which lie outside the limits of this Commonwealth. There were, moreover, more than five hundred states, ruled by Indian Princes, with a total area of about 1,813,000 square kilometres, which commemorated the vanished glory of defunct kingdoms and empires, and enjoyed a certain amount of autonomy in internal affairs under the aegis of the British Crown. They have now been integrated with either India or Pakistan.

The magnitude of the population of India is quite in keeping with the immensity of its geographical dimensions. As early as the fifth century B.C. Herodotus observed that "of all the nations that we know, it is India which has the largest population". The total number of inhabitants included within the sub-continent, excluding Burma, according to the Census of 1961, amounted to about five hundred and twenty millions, or about one-sixth of that of the whole world. This huge assemblage of human beings is made up of diverse ethnic groups, split up into countless castes, professing numerous creeds, speaking about two hundred different languages and dialects. It represents every phase of social evolution, from that of the primitive tribesman who still lives by hunting and collecting forest produce, to that of the polished inhabitant of cities well equipped with the most up-to-date scientific or humanistic lore.

A close examination of this variegated conglomeration of races,

castes and creeds reveals, however, a deep underlying unity which is apt to be missed by the superficial observer. This unity was undoubtedly nurtured in the nineteenth century by a uniform system of administration, easy means of communication and the spread of education on modern lines. It is a mistake, however, to suppose that it is wholly the outcome of recent events and was quite non-existent in ages long gone by. The fundamental unity of India is emphasised by the name *Bhārata-Varsha*, or land of Bharata, given to the whole country in the Epics and the Purāṇas, and the designation *Bhāratī santati*, or descendants of Bharata, applied to its people.

> "*Uttaram yat samudrasya*
> *Himādreśchaiva dakshiṇam,*
> *Varsham tad Bhāratam nāma*
> *Bhāratī yatra santatiḥ.*"
> (Vishṇu Purāṇa, II, 3. 1.)

"The country that lies north of the ocean and south of the snowy mountains is called Bhārata; there dwell the descendants of Bharata."

This sense of unity was ever present before the minds of the theologians, political philosophers and poets who spoke of the "thousand *Yojanas* (leagues) of land that stretch from the Himālayas to the sea as the proper domain of a single universal emperor" and eulogised monarchs who sought to extend their sway from the snowy mountains in the north to Adam's Bridge in the south, and from the valley of the Brahmaputra in the east to the land beyond the seven mouths of the Indus in the west. In the third century B.C. a single language, Prākṛit, sufficed to bring the message of a royal missionary to the doors of his humblest subjects throughout this vast sub-continent. A few centuries later another language, Sanskrit, found its way to the royal archives of the remotest corners of this country. The ancient epics—the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*—were studied with as much devotion in the courts of the Tamil and Kanarese countries as in the intellectual circles of Taxila in the western Punjab, and *Naimishāraṇya* in the upper Ganges valley. The old religion of the Vedas and the Purāṇas still gives solace to the vast majority of the people of this country, and temples in honour of Śiva and Vishṇu raise their spires on the snowy heights of the Himālayas as well as in the flat deltas of the Kṛishṇā and the Kāverī. The religious communities that do not worship in these shrines have not been altogether unaffected by their Hindu surroundings.

Instances are not unknown of friendship and communion between saints and prophets of rival creeds. Since the days of al-Biruni many adherents of Islam, the second great religion of India in point of numbers, have shown a profound interest in the science, philosophy and religion of their Hindu brethren, and to this day Hindu practices are not altogether a negligible factor in the village life of this country for the votaries of a different creed. Islam with its ideals of social democracy and imperialism has, in its turn, done much to counteract the fissiparous tendencies of caste and check the centrifugal forces in Indian politics by keeping alive the ideal of a Pan-Indian State throughout the Middle Ages.

CHAPTER II

THE PRE-HISTORIC PERIOD

HISTORY is a record of the achievements of man. The history of India, like the annals of every other country, should therefore begin with an account of the times when men first settled in this land. But history proper only deals with facts, and facts can only be known from records of some kind or other. We cannot know the history of any people who have left no record of their existence. There may have been people or peoples who lived in India in primitive times, but the evidence of whose existence has not yet been discovered. For the present, at any rate, they must be left out of account altogether. We shall only deal with those inhabitants of India whose existence is known to us from some records they have left behind.

To begin with, these records consist almost solely of the rude implements which the people used in their daily lives. According to the nature and material of these implements, the earliest settlers in India have been divided into two classes, viz., Palaeolithic and Neolithic.

Palaeolithic Men

The term Palaeolithic is derived from two Greek words meaning Old Stone. This name is applied to the earliest people, as the only evidence of their existence is furnished by a number of rude stone implements. These are small pieces of rough undressed stones, chipped into various forms, which were originally fitted with handles made of sticks or bones. They served as weapons for hunting wild animals, and could also be used as hammers or for purposes of cutting and boring.

These chipped stones have been found in large numbers in different parts of India. They are usually, though not exclusively, made of a species of hard rock called "quartzite". From this fact the Palaeolithic men in India are also known as "Quartzite men".

From the rough and rude stone implements which are the only records left behind by the earliest-known inhabitants of India, we



STRAIGHT-EDGED CLEAVER OF BROWNISH QUARTZITE: CHINGLEPUT DISTRICT, MADRAS PRESIDENCY



POLISHED CELT WITH POINTED BUTT OF SPECKLED TRAP. BÂNDÂ DISTRICT, ÂGRA PROVINCE (U.P.)

POLISHED SHOULDERED CELT WITH ADZE-LIKE EDGE, OF DARK GREY SLATE, FROM THE TRANS-GANGETIC AREA

can form only a very vague idea of their lives and habits. It is obvious that they were ignorant of any metals, and most of them had no fixed homes, though a few might have made huts of some sort with trees and leaves. They lived in constant dread of wild animals like tigers, lions, elephants and the rhinoceros. They

had no idea of agriculture, but lived on the flesh of animals and such fruits and vegetables as grew wild in jungles. They could not make pottery, and probably did not even know how to make a fire. In short, from our standpoint we can only regard them as savages, little removed from an animal life. It is well to remember this if we are to judge aright the long strides that men have made in developing that culture and civilisation of which we are so justly proud to-day.

It has been suggested that the Palaeolithic men belonged to the Negrito race, like the modern people of the Andaman Islands, and were characterised by short stature, dark skin, woolly hair and flat noses.

Neolithic Men

The capacity for progress is, however, an inherent characteristic of human beings which distinguishes them from animals. Consequently, as years rolled by, men acquired greater knowledge and skill in mastering the forces of nature. The rate of progress is, of course, difficult to estimate, and it may have been hundreds or thousands of years before a distinctly higher type of civilisation was evolved in India. The men who belonged to this age are called Neolithic. This term is also derived from two Greek words meaning New Stone. The significance of this name lies in the fact that in this age also men had to depend solely on stone implements, and were ignorant of any metals, except gold. But their implements were very different from those of the preceding age, for they used stones other than quartzite, and these were not merely chipped, but in most cases "ground, grooved and polished" as well. They were highly finished articles made into different forms to serve various purposes. They can be easily distinguished from the rough and rude implements of the Palaeolithic Age.

Remains of the Neolithic men are found in almost every part of India. An ancient factory for the manufacture of stone implements has been discovered in the Bellary district, Madras, where we can still trace the various stages of their construction.

The civilisation of the Neolithic men shows distinct traces of advance. They cultivated land and grew fruits and corn. They also domesticated animals like the ox and the goat. They knew the art of producing fire by the friction of bamboos or pieces of wood, and made pottery, at first by hand, and then with the potter's wheel. They lived in caves and decorated their walls by painting scenes of hunting and dancing. A few of these can be seen to-day both in Northern and Southern India. They also painted and

decorated their pottery. They constructed boats and went out to sea. They could spin cotton and wool and weave cloth. They used to bury their dead, and neolithic tombs have been discovered in some parts of India. Sometimes the dead body was put in a large urn and many of these urns have been discovered intact under the ground. The tombs known as *Dolmens* consist of three or more stone props in a circle, supporting a massive roof stone. These dolmens or megalithic tombs are characteristic of the Neolithic Age all over the world. Scholars also distinguish a culture midway between Palaeolithic and Neolithic, and call it Mesolithic (from Greek "*meso*" = middle). Its two chief characteristics were, first, that the stone implements used were extremely small, only about an inch in length (hence known as microlith from Greek "*micro*" = small); and secondly, that instead of quartzite they were made of chalcedony and other silicate varieties by a technical process differing from that employed in the Palaeolithic Age.

The age of the Palaeolithic and Neolithic men is called prehistoric, as we know hardly anything of this period save the meagre evidence supplied by the cave drawings and stone implements. We have not even any definite knowledge regarding the relations between these two groups of men. There are indications that suggest that the Neolithic men may have been the descendants of their Palaeolithic predecessors. But there are certain facts which militate against this view. Some scholars are of the opinion that not only are there no such relationships, but that there was a gap of many hundreds or thousands of years between the two periods. So long as our evidence remains as meagre as it now is, there will always be scope for such differences of opinion, and we shall have to deal with theories or hypotheses based on speculations. The question, however, belongs to the domain of anthropology rather than history, and need not be pursued any further.

The Age of Metals

There is, however, a general agreement that Neolithic men were the ancestors of the people who ushered in the next stage of civilisation which is distinguished by the knowledge and use of metals. That the transition from stone to metal was a slow and gradual process is proved by two undeniable facts, viz., the use of stone and metallic implements side by side, and the close resemblance in the shape of early metal and Neolithic implements.

There was, however, no uniformity in the use of metals in

different parts of India. In Northern India, copper replaced stone as the ordinary material for tools and weapons. Axes, swords, spear-heads and various other objects made of that metal have come to light in different parts of the country. It was not till centuries later that iron came to be known and gradually used as a substitute for copper. We can thus distinguish between a Copper Age and the Early Iron Age in Northern India. In Southern India, however, the Iron Age immediately succeeded the Stone Age, and we find no traces of the intermediate Copper Age.

Bronze is a good substitute for copper. It is an alloy made up of nine parts of copper and one of tin, and, being harder than copper, is more suitable for the manufacture of tools and weapons. We find accordingly that in some countries in Europe a Bronze Age succeeded the Neolithic. Bronze implements of early date have been found in India along with those of copper, but it does not appear that that metal was ever generally used in India to the exclusion of copper. In other words, there was, properly speaking, no Bronze Age in India.

With the Copper and Iron Ages we enter the limits of the historical period. It is a moot point to decide whether the period of the *Ṛig-Veda*—the earliest period of Indian history for which we possess literary evidence—belongs to the former or to the latter epoch. The general opinion is in favour of the view that the Iron Age had already commenced when the *Ṛig-Veda* was composed. Be that as it may, we have now a splendid example of the civilisation of the Copper Age. This civilisation flourished in the Indus Valley and spread over the neighbouring regions to a considerable distance. It is known as the Indus Valley civilisation and merits a detailed treatment in view of its importance. But before taking it up we must say a few words about the races of India.

Classes of People

If we examine the people of India, both according to physical type and language, we can easily distinguish four broad classes.

First, the majority of high-class Hindus, who are tall, fair-skinned and long-nosed and whose language is derived from Sanskrit. These are known as Aryans or Indo-Aryans.

Secondly, the people mostly living in the South Indian Peninsula, whose features are somewhat different from those of the first group and whose languages—Tamil, Telugu, Kanarese and Malayalam—are entirely different from Sanskrit. These are called by the generic name of "Dravidians".

Thirdly, primitive tribes living in hills and jungles who offer a striking contrast to the first category in physical type, being short in stature, dark-skinned and snub-nosed. Their languages are also quite different from those of the preceding two. The Kols, Bhīls and Muṇḍās belong to this class.

Fourthly, a people with strong Mongolian features, beardless, yellow in colour, snub-nosed, with flat faces and prominent cheekbones. These mostly live on the slopes of the Himālayas and mountains of Assam. The Gurkhās, Bhutiyas and Khāsis are striking examples of this class.

The last two classes of people may be regarded as descendants of the Neolithic peoples. We have already referred to the primitive type of civilisation in the Neolithic Age, and it does not appear that these peoples have made any appreciable progress during the thousands of years that have elapsed since then.

There is hardly any doubt that these primitive races at one time spread all over India. But they had to yield to the superior forces of the Dravidians, who gradually occupied some of their lands. The same process was repeated when large tracts of the country were conquered at a later time by the Aryans. The effect of these successive invasions by more cultured races on the primitive peoples was far-reaching. Many must have perished, and many more, reduced to subjection, formed the lowest strata in the community of the conquerors, while a few bands were saved from a similar fate by the shelter offered by fastnesses and jungles. This last category alone has preserved, to a certain extent, the physical features, the languages, and the habits of their remote ancestors, offering us a fair glimpse of the sort of life they must have led in times long gone by.

Philological researches have established a connection between these Neolithic peoples of India and the primitive tribes that lived in Indo-China, the Malay Peninsula and the Indian Archipelago. The German scholar Schmidt, for example, holds that the languages of the Muṇḍās and Khāsis belong to the same family of speech (called Austric) from which those of the peoples of Indo-China and Indonesia have been derived. According to this view, these peoples, who were originally settled in India, "passed gradually to the east and south-east and traversed, at first the whole length of the Indo-Chinese peninsula, and then over all the islands of the Pacific Ocean up to its eastern extremity". Schmidt further believed that another current of emigration of the same people also started from India, but turned more directly towards the south and, touching only the western fringe of the

Pacific Ocean, proceeded, perhaps by way of New Guinea, towards the continent of Australia.

According to Schmidt's view, the Neolithic men of India played a dominant part in the early history of South-eastern Asia. But his theory has already been challenged by other scholars and can only be regarded as a provisional hypothesis.

The Indus Valley Civilisation

In recent years archaeological excavations have been carried on at Mohenjo-Daro in the Larkana district, Sind, and at Harappā, in the Montgomery district of the Punjab. These and smaller trial excavations at various other sites in Sind, Baluchistān, Punjab and even further east and south, have proved beyond doubt that some four or five thousand years ago a highly civilised community flourished in these regions. The antiquity of civilisation in India is thus carried back nearly to the same period which witnessed the growth of ancient civilisations in Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia. The valley of the Indus thus takes its rank with the valleys of the Nile, the Tigris, and the Euphrates as having contributed to the most ancient phase of human civilisation of which we are yet aware.

Unfortunately we have no written records about the Indus valley civilisation comparable to those we possess in respect of the others. A number of seals have been discovered with a few letters engraved on each, but these still remain undeciphered. We are therefore totally ignorant of the political history of the Indus valley and are not in a position to form an adequate idea of its culture and civilisation. We possess, at best, a vague and general idea of the subject which is entirely derived from a careful examination of the objects unearthed at Mohenjo-Daro and Harappā.

Mohenjo-Daro—Mound of the Dead—is the local name of a high mound situated in the plains of Larkana in a narrow strip of land between the main bed of the Indus river and the western Nara canal. The surrounding region is wonderfully fertile and is called even to-day Nakhlistān, or the "Garden of Sind". Here a city was built some five thousand years ago. This city was successively destroyed and rebuilt no less than seven times, the inundation of the Indus being perhaps the chief agency of destruction. The rebuilding did not always immediately follow the destruction, but sometimes the city remained in ruins for a considerable period before a new city rose upon them. Thus, after the foundation of the city, many centuries passed before it was finally abandoned.

The ruins of this city have now been laid bare, and we shall try to sum up what we have been able to learn about it and the people who lived therein.

The City

The city is fairly big. The dwelling-houses are many in number and vary in size from a small building with two rooms to a palatial structure having a frontage of 26 metres and a depth of 29·5 metres, with outer walls 1·25 to 1·5 metres thick. They are made of bricks which are usually well burnt and of good quality. Sometimes very large bricks, measuring 51·5 centimetres long, 26·5 centimetres broad and 9 centimetres thick, are used. The big houses have two or

MOHENJO-DARO. THE GREAT BATH

more storeys and are furnished with paved floors and courtyards, doors, windows and narrow stairways. It is specially noteworthy that almost every house has wells, drains and bathrooms.

In addition to the numerous dwelling-houses, we find a few spacious buildings of elaborate structure and design. Some of these contain large pillared halls, one of them measuring 24 metres square. The exact nature and purpose of these buildings cannot be ascertained. They are thought to have been palaces, temples or municipal halls.

The most imposing structure in the city is the Great Bath. It consists of a large open quadrangle in the centre with galleries

and rooms on all sides. In the centre of the quadrangle is a large swimming enclosure, 12 metres long, 7 metres wide and about 2·4 metres deep. It has a flight of steps at either end and is fed by a well situated in one of the adjoining rooms. The water is discharged by a huge drain with a corbelled roof more than 1·8 metres in height. The Great Bath is 55 metres long and 33 metres wide, and its outer

Copyright. Archæological Survey of India

LIMESTONE STATUE. MOHENJO-DARO

walls are about 2·4 metres thick. The solidity of the construction is amply borne out by the fact that it has successfully withstood the ravages of five thousand years.

The streets of the city are wide and straight and are furnished with an elaborate drainage system together with soak-pits for sediment.

On the whole, the ruins leave no doubt that there was on this site a large, populous and flourishing town whose inhabitants freely

enjoyed, to a degree unknown elsewhere in the ancient world, not only the sanitary conveniences but also the luxuries and comforts of a highly-developed municipal life. We must also conclude that the art of building had reached a high degree of perfection.

The People

The ruins of Mohenjo-Daro tell us a great deal about the people who lived in this luxurious city, and, as they afford us the first comprehensive view of the culture and civilisation of India, we

MOHENJO-DARO. JEWELLERY

must note the essential features of the social, economic and religious condition under appropriate heads or items.

Food. Wheat was the principal article of food, but barley and palm-date were also familiar. They also used mutton, pork, fish and eggs.

Dress and ornaments. Cotton fabrics were in common use, but wool was also used, evidently for warm textiles. Ornaments were worn by both men and women of all classes. Necklaces, fillets, armlets, finger-rings and bangles were worn by both men and women; and girdles, nose-studs, ear-rings and anklets by women alone. There was great variety in the shape and design of these ornaments, and some of them are of singular beauty. These ornaments

were made of gold, silver, ivory, copper and both precious and semi-precious stones like jade, crystal, agate, carnelian, and *lapis lazuli*.

Household articles. The earthenware vessels, of rich variety, were made with the potter's wheel and were either plain or painted. In rare cases they were glazed. Vessels of copper, bronze, silver, and porcelain were known, though very rarely used. It is important to bear in mind that not a scrap of iron has been found, and that metal was obviously unknown.

Among other articles of domestic use may be mentioned spindles and spindle whorls made of baked earth, porcelain and shell; needles and combs, made of bone or ivory; axes, chisels, knives, sickles, fishhooks and razors made of copper and bronze; small cubical blocks of hard stone, probably used as weights.

The children's toys included, in addition to familiar articles, small wheeled carts and chairs, and we may easily infer that these were used in actual life. The discovery of dice-pieces shows the prevalence of that game.

Domesticated animals. The remains of skeletons prove that the humped bull, the buffalo, sheep, elephant and camel were domesticated. There are some doubts about the horse. The carvings of dogs on children's toys show that that animal was also familiar.

Weapons of War. These include axes, spears, daggers, maces and slings, with comparatively fewer specimens of bows and arrows. The absence of swords is significant. Shields, helmets or any other defensive armour are conspicuous by their absence. The weapons of war, all offensive in character, are usually made of copper and bronze, though a few stone implements have also been found.

Seals. More than five hundred seals have been discovered. These are made of terra cotta and small in size. Some contain fine representations of animal figures—both mythical and real—engraved on them. All of them contain a short record inscribed in a sort of pictorial writing which still remains undeciphered.

Fine Art. The representations of the animals carved on these seals often exhibit a high degree of excellence. A few stone images found at Harappā recall the finish and excellence of Greek statues and show a high degree of development in the sculptor's art.

Trade and Commerce. The seals were most probably used in connection with trade. Indeed there is abundant evidence that the people traded not only with other parts of India but also with many countries of Asia. It is certain that they secured tin, copper and precious stones from beyond India.

Arts and Crafts. Some aspects of the art and industry of the early Indus people have been dealt with above. Agriculture must have played an important part in the daily life of the common people, and among other things wheat, barley and cotton were cultivated on a large scale. Among the industrial classes, the potter, the weaver, the carpenter, the mason, the blacksmith, the goldsmith, the jeweller, the ivory-worker and stone-cutter were the most important.

A great advance in technical knowledge is indicated by the potter's wheel, kiln-burnt brick, the boring of hard substances like carnelian, and the casting and alloy of metals. A high aesthetic sense is indicated by the beautiful designs of ornaments, the superb relief figures on seals and the execution of fine stone statues.

SEAL. MOHENJO-DARO

Copyright. Archaeological Survey of India

Religion. The objects found at Mohenjo-Daro also teach us something about the religious faiths and beliefs of the people. The cult of the Divine Mother seems to have been widely prevalent, and many figurines of this Mother-Goddess have come to light. This cult may not be exactly the same as the Śakti-worship of later days, but the fundamental ideas appear to be the same, viz., the belief in a female energy as the source of all creation.

Along with this, there was also a male-god who has been identified as the prototype of the God Śiva. On one particular seal, he seems to be represented as seated in the *Yoga* posture, surrounded by animals. He has three visible faces, and two horns on two sides of a tall head-dress. It is very interesting to note how this figure corresponds with, and to a certain extent explains, the later conception of Śiva. As is well known, Śiva is regarded as

a *Mahāyogin*, and is styled *Paśupati* or the lord of beasts, his chief attributes being three eyes and the *Triśūla* or the trident. Now the apparent *Yoga* posture of the figure in Mohenjo-Daro justifies the epithet *Mahāyogin*, and the figures of animals round him explain the epithet *Paśupati*. The three faces of the figure may not be unconnected with the later conception of three eyes, and the two horns with the tall head-dress might have easily given rise to the conception of a trident with three drongs.

The identification of the male-god with Śiva is further strengthened by the discovery of stone pieces which look exactly like a *Śiva-liṅga*, the form in which Śiva is almost universally worshipped to-day.

In addition to the worship of Śiva and Śakti, both in human and symbolic forms, we find the prevalence of that primitive religious faith which we call animism. It means worship of stones, trees and animals in the belief that these are abodes of spirits, good or evil. A natural corollary of this faith is the worship of Nāgas, Yakshas, etc., who are embodiments of these spirits. Clear traces of all these are found at Mohenjo-Daro.

It is obvious, therefore, that modern Hinduism, which possesses all the features mentioned above, was indebted, to a great extent, to the Indus-valley culture. Indications of the existence of the *Bhakti* cult (loving devotion to a personal God), and even of some philosophical doctrine like Metempsychosis, have also been found at Mohenjo-Daro. We must therefore hold that there is an organic relationship between the ancient culture of the Indus valley and the Hinduism of to-day.

General Conclusions

The study of the Indus-valley civilisation raises several interesting problems of a general nature. In the first place it offers a striking resemblance to the ancient civilisations in Sumer and Mesopotamia proper. The developed city-life, use of the potter's wheel, kiln-burnt bricks, and vessels made of copper and bronze, and, above all, the pictorial writings, are some of the common and distinctive features of all the three civilisations of the pre-historic period. The discovery of two seals of the Mohenjo-Daro type in Elam and Mesopotamia, and of a cuneiform inscription at Mohenjo-Daro, leaves no doubt that there was intercourse between these countries. The question therefore naturally arises, were these three civilisations developed independently, or was any of them an

offshoot of the other? To put the same thing in another form, did the civilisation spread from the Indus valley to the west or *vice versa*? Or are we to assume that the growth of civilisation in the Indus valley was uninfluenced in any way by the sister-civilisations in the west?

These and connected questions cannot be answered definitely. It will suffice to say that all the alternative hypotheses mentioned above have their supporters and opponents.

The next question, and one of greater practical importance, is the relationship of the Indus-valley culture with the Vedic civilisation of the Indo-Aryans, which is usually regarded as the source from which issued all the subsequent civilisations in India. On the face of it there are striking differences between the two. The Vedic Aryans were largely rural, while the characteristic features of the Indus-valley civilisation are the amenities of a developed city life. The former probably knew of iron and defensive armour, which are totally absent in the latter. The horse played an eminent part in the Vedic civilisation, but its early existence is doubted in the Indus valley. There were also important differences in respect of religious beliefs and practices. The Vedic Aryans worshipped the cow while the Indus people reserved their veneration for bulls. Not only do the Mother-Goddess and Śiva, the chief deities of the Indus valley, play but a minor part in the early *Veda*, but the latter, according to some interpreters, definitely condemns phallic worship. The worship of images was familiar in the Indus valley, but almost unknown to the Vedic Aryans.

In view of these striking dissimilarities, the Indus-valley civilisation is usually regarded as different from and anterior to the culture of the Vedic period. This also fits in well with the generally accepted chronological scheme. For, as noted above, the Indus-valley civilisation goes back to the third millennium B.C., while the date usually assigned to the *Ṛig-Veda* does not go beyond the second millennium B.C. But some would place the Vedic civilisation before that of the Indus valley and shift the date of the *Ṛig-Veda* to a period before 3000 B.C.

The question is not indeed free from difficulties. While the points of difference would undoubtedly incline us to the view that the Indus-valley civilisation and Vedic civilisation represent two different types of culture, the arguments for the priority of the one to the other are not conclusive. The reference to iron in the *Ṛig-Veda* would have indeed been a very strong argument for relegating the Vedic civilisation to a later period, but this is at best doubtful. As regards the other points, the data are not established

sufficiently well to warrant a definite conclusion. On the whole, however, the priority of the Indus-valley civilisation appears to be more probable, and at present holds the field.

Be that as it may, there is not the least doubt that we can no longer accept the view, now generally held, that Vedic civilisation is the sole foundation of all subsequent civilisations in India. That the Indus-valley civilisation described above has been a very important contributory factor to the growth and development of civilisation in this country admits of no doubt.

Lastly, there is the question of the race of the people among whom the Indus-valley civilisation grew. The preceding discussion would prepare us for some of the replies that have been given. Some hold that they were the same as the Sumerians, while others hold that they were Dravidians. Some again believe that these two were identical. According to this view, the Dravidians at one time inhabited the whole of India, including the Punjab, Sind and Baluchistān, and gradually migrated to Mesopotamia. The fact that the Dravidian language is still spoken by the Brahui people of Baluchistān is taken to lend strength to this view.

There is also a theory that the "Indus" people were Aryans, but this at present finds but few supporters. It is impossible to come to any definite conclusion on this point, and there is always the possibility that the people of the Indus valley might have belonged to an altogether separate race.

CHAPTER III

THE EARLY VEDIC AGE

Early Aryan Settlements

INDIA, as is well known, derives its name from the Sindhu (Indus), and the earliest civilisation of this country of which we have any definite trace had its cradle in the valley of the same river. We have seen in the last chapter that excavations at several places in the lower part of the valley have laid bare the ruins of well-built cities, and seals surprisingly similar to those discovered at Eshnunna, Kish and Ur in Mesopotamia, and assigned by archæologists to the third millennium B.C., have been found. The identity of the originators of this early Indus culture is uncertain. They appear to have professed a religion that was iconic and laid emphasis on the worship of the Mother-Goddess and a male deity who seems to have been the prototype of Śiva. The phallic cult was prevalent, but fire-pits were conspicuous by their absence.

Far different is the picture of another civilisation which had its principal home higher up the Indus valley. The people who evolved this culture called themselves *Āryas* or Aryans. Their earliest literature makes no reference to life in stately cities comparable to those whose remains have been unearthed at Harappā and Mohenjo-Daro. Their religion was normally aniconic,[1] and in their pantheon the female element was subordinated to the male, and the place of honour was given to deities like Indra, Varuṇa, Mitra, the Nāsatyas, Sūrya, Agni (Fire) and other supernal beings who seem to have been quite unknown to the originators of the "Indus" culture as described in the last chapter. Unfortunately, the early literature of the Āryas—called the *Veda*—cannot be dated even approximately, and it is impossible to say with absolute precision in what chronological relation the civilisation portrayed in the *Veda* stood to the "Indus" culture of the third millennium B.C. Max Müller hesitatingly placed the beginning of the Vedic literature in the latter half of the second millennium B.C. Tilak and Jacobi, on the other hand, tried to push the date much farther back on astronomical grounds. But, as pointed out by several Indologists,

[1] i.e. in which images played no part.

astronomical calculations prove nothing unless the texts in question admit of unambiguous interpretation. Tilak himself points out how unsafe it is to act upon calculations based on loose statements in literature regarding the position of the heavenly bodies.

In the chaotic state of early Aryan chronology, it is a welcome relief to turn to Asia Minor and other countries in Western Asia and find in certain tablets of the fourteenth century B.C., discovered at Boghaz Keui and other places, references to kings who bore Aryan names and invoked the gods Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa and the Nāsatyas to witness and safeguard treaties. It is certain that the tablets belong to a period in the evolution of the Aryan religion when Indra, Varuṇa, and the other gods associated with them, still retained their early Vedic pre-eminence and had not yet been thrown into the shade by the Brāhmaṇic *Prajāpati* or the epic and Purāṇic *Trimūrti*.

Did the worshippers of Indra go from an earlier home in the Indus valley to Asia Minor or was the process just the reverse of this? In this connection it is interesting to note that in one passage of the *Ṛig-Veda* a worshipper invokes from his *pratna okas*, or ancient abode, the god Indra whom his ancestors formerly invoked. We are also told that Yadu and Turvaśa, two among the most famous Ṛig-Vedic tribes, were brought by Indra from a distant land. The former is in several passages brought into special relation with *Paśu* or *Parśu*, a name borne by the ancient people of Persia. The latter took part in a conflict with a king who is styled a *Pārthava*, a name that reminds us of Irān and is comparable to *Parśu* mentioned in connection with the Yadus. If the name *Hariyūpīyā*, which is the designation of a river or a city according to the commentators, and is associated with the mysterious people called Vṛichīvats who "broke the sacrificial vessels", can be connected with Harappā, as has already been suggested by some, we have here an interesting glimpse of a period when that great centre of early Indus civilisation formed a battle-ground of fierce invaders exulting in the worship of Indra, clad in coats of mail (*varmīnaḥ*) and possessed of "prancing horses", both of which the warriors of the lower Indus culture possibly lacked.

The Indra-worshipping tribes seem to have been divided into two rival groups. One of these included the Sṛiñjayas and their allies the Bharatas, both lauded by the priestly family of the Bhāraḍvājas. To the other group belonged the Yadus, Turvaśas, Druhyus, Anus and Pūrus who are found frequently in alliance with indigenous tribes. The first two tribes of the second group are branded as *Dāsas* in one passage of the *Ṛig-Veda*, and of the

remaining three, the Pūrus are styled *mṛidhravāchah*, "of hostile speech", an epithet otherwise applied only to the non-Aryan *Dasyus*.

Distinct from both these Indra-worshipping groups were the *Dāsas* proper or *Dasyus*, a dark-skinned, flat-nosed race who spoke a tongue unintelligible to the Aryans, possessed forts and herds of cattle coveted by the new-comers, despised the sacrificial religion of the latter and possibly worshipped the phallus. This latter characteristic connects them with the men who evolved the pre-historic civilisation of the lower Indus valley.

It may be that the folk (*jana*) of the Bharatas represents an Aryan stock altogether different from that of the Yadu group. The memory of the migration of the Bharatas is not distinctly preserved in any of the hymns, while Yadus and Turvaśas are expressly mentioned as new arrivals. In the *Ṛig-Veda* Bharata princes are found sacrificing on the Dṛishadvatī, the Sarasvatī and the Āpayā, all rivers in the western part of the *Madhya-deśa*, far away from the north-west frontier. It is interesting to note that they are specially associated with the cult of Agni, the Fire-God, a deity conspicuous by his absence in the Boghaz Keui records of the fourteenth century B.C., and of whose worship no traces are found in the early ruins of Mohenjo-Daro.

The Bharatas were at first admittedly inferior to their foes and were "shorn of their possessions ... but Vasishṭha became their family priest, and the people of the Tṛitsus prospered". Tṛitsu seems to have been the name of the ruling dynasty of the Bharatas, the most famous representatives of which were Divodāsa and his son or grandson Sudās. Opposed to the Tṛitsus and the allied tribe of the Sṛiñjayas stood the Yadus, Turvaśas, Druhyus, Anus and Pūrus.

It is clear that the Bharatas and their allies did not like the idea of being permanently "shorn of their possessions" by their enemies. The result was that the two rival groups of tribes engaged in a deadly struggle with one another. In one of these contests the Sṛiñjayas scattered the forces of the Turvasas and their allies the Vṛichīvats. In another and a more famous conflict, known as the Battle of the Ten Kings, Sudās, the Tṛitsu king, defeated the hostile tribes, who were joined on the river Parushṇī (Rāvi) by the Śivas, Pakthas and associate tribes from the north-west. The Bharatas now definitely established their pre-eminence among the Aryan folks, and a late Vedic text—the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*—refers to an old *gāthā* which describes "the greatness of the Bharatas neither the men before nor those after them attained".

More important than the internal conflicts of the Aryans were their struggles with the non-Aryans, which gradually led to a

considerable extension of the Aryan dominion towards the east. To Divodāsa belongs the credit of fighting against a *Dāsa* chieftain named Śambara. His policy was continued by Sudās who crushed a hostile combination of indigenous tribes on the banks of the Jumnā. Under the guidance of a priest named Viśvāmitra, the Bharatas even seem to have entertained designs against the Kīkaṭas, a non-Aryan people traditionally associated with South Bihār. In the campaign against the *Dāsas*, the Bharatas were ably seconded by their rivals the Pūrus, one of whose kings bore the significant name of Trasadasyu, i.e. "terror to the Dasyus".

The geographical area eventually occupied by the Ṛig-Vedic tribes is clearly indicated by the mention of certain rivers which permit of easy identification. The most important among these are the Kubhā (Kābul), the Suvāstu (Swāt), the Krumu (Kurram), the Gomatī (Gumal), the Sindhu (Indus), the Sushomā (Sohān), the Vitastā (Jhelum), the Asiknī (Chenāb), the Marudvṛidhā (Maruwardwan), the Parushṇī (Rāvī), the Vipāś (Bias), the Śutudri (Sutlej), the Sarasvatī, the Dṛishadvatī (the Rakshi or Chitang), the Jumnā, the Gangā, and the Sarayū. The mention of these rivers implies the possession by the Aryans of a considerable portion of the country stretching from eastern Afghanistan to the upper valley of the Ganges. The major part of this area came to be known as *Sapta Sindhu*—the Land of the Seven Rivers. The whole of this extensive tract of land could not have been occupied entirely by Aryan tribes, because we hear also of the clans (*Viśaḥ*) of the *Dāsas* who must have occupied some part at least of this territory, and whose supersession in any case must have been a slow and gradual process. Moreover, vast tracts of country were still covered with forest (*araṇyānī*) or were altogether barren, containing only a few wells (*prapā*) here and there.

Political Organisation of the Rig-Vedic Aryans

The basis of the political and social organisation of the Ṛig-Vedic people was the patriarchal family. The successive higher units were styled *grāma*, *viś* and *jana*, and in some rare passages we even hear of aggregates of *janas*. The precise relationship between the *grāma*, the *viś* and the *jana* is nowhere distinctly stated. That the *grāma* was normally a smaller unit than either the *viś* or the *jana* appears probable from the fact that the *grāmaṇī*, the leader of the *grāma* (horde or village), who is usually a *Vaiśya*, is clearly inferior to the lord of the *viś* (*viśpati*) or the protector (*gopā*) of the *jana*, who is often the king himself.

It is more difficult to say in what relationship the *viś* stood to the *jana*. In some Vedic passages there is a clear contrast between the two, and Irānian analogies seem to suggest that the *viś* is a sub-division of a *jana*, if the latter may be taken as a parallel to the Irānian *Zantu*.

The prevailing form of government among the Ṛig-Vedic tribes was monarchical. But names applied in later ages to non-monarchical communities were also known. We have references to the *gaṇa* with the *gaṇapati* or *jyeshṭha* (elder) at its head. The mention of the term *jyeshṭha*, which corresponds to *jeṭṭhaka* of the Pāli texts, possibly points to some sort of organisation parallel to that of the well-known tribal republics of early Buddhist times.

The Ṛig-Vedic state (*rāshṭra*) seems, however, to have been normally ruled by a potentate styled *rājan* (king) who was "without a rival and a destroyer of rivals". Kingship was usually hereditary. Thus the Pūrus and the Tṛitsus, two among the most famous of the Ṛig-Vedic clans, had as their rulers dynasties of princes, some of whose names are recorded in the *Ṛik-Saṁhitā*. Elective monarchies were perhaps not altogether unknown, though the *Ṛig-Veda* has no clear reference to them. In the *Atharva Veda* and the Great Epic, however, we have several explicit references to the election of the *rājan* to the kingship by the people, and in the *Ṛig-Veda* itself the need of the people's approval, if sovereignty is to be steady and unvacillating, is emphasised in the consecration hymns. In addition to the title *rājan* we come across the designation *samrāṭ*, which in later times undoubtedly meant a paramount ruler. In the *Ṛig-Veda*, however, there is no trace of any terrestrial kingship of the Mauryan or Gupta type, though the idea of a universal monarch (*viśvasya bhuvanasya rājā*) is met with.

The *rājan* occupied a position of pre-eminence in the tribe. He was formally consecrated to kingship and was marked out from the commonalty by his shining robes and the splendid palace where he lived, surrounded by his officers and retainers and lauded by priests and singers.

The foremost duty of the king was the protection of the tribe and the tribal territory. He fought against external enemies. He employed spies (*spaśu*) to watch over the conduct of the people who were apparently punished when they went wrong. He had to maintain a body of priests who performed the sacred rites and received a contribution (*bali*) from the people. The king was assisted by a number of functionaries of whom the most important was the *Purohita* or chaplain. The *Purohita* not only gave advice to the ruler, but used his spells and charms to secure the success

of his patron's arms and lauded his exploits when victory was won. Another important official was the *Senānī* or the leader of the army. About the organisation of the *Senā* or army which he led, our information is meagre. It must have included foot soldiers, later called *Patti*, as well as *Rathins* or warriors who fought from chariots. "Prancing horses" are also alluded to in certain battle songs. But the use of the elephant in war was as yet uncommon. Warriors of noble descent wore coats of mail, metal helmets, and hand-guards. The chief offensive weapon was the bow. Two kinds of arrows were used; one was poisoned and had a head of horn; the other was copper or iron-headed (*ayomukham*). Spears, swords and axes are also mentioned. We have also reference to the *pur charishṇu* or moving fort which may have been an engine for assaulting strongholds. Banners were used in war, and musical instruments are mentioned. The army may have been divided into units termed *śardha*, *vrāta* and *gaṇa*, but the matter is obscure. *Kulapas* or heads of families fought under the banner of the *Vrājapati*, who is sometimes identified with the *Grāmanī*. The latter functionary was probably the head of the village both for civil and military purposes. Forts or strongholds were under the *Pūrpati*. The Vedic king had a system of espionage and also employed *dūtas* or messengers.

The *rājan*, though the lord of the people, did not govern without their consent. The business of the tribe was carried out in a popular assembly styled *Samiti*, at which princes and people were alike present. We have also references to another body, termed *Sabhā*, which some regard as a Council of Elders. Others think it was a village assembly or the place of meeting which also served as a centre for social gatherings. Certain passages of the *Ṛig-Veda* seem to connect the *Sabhā* with the men of wealth, opulence and goodly form, and this lends countenance to the view that in the main it functioned as a Council of Elders rather than an assembly of the whole tribe. Women at any rate were, according to a later Vedic text, excluded from the *Sabhā*. The *Sabhā* gave decisions regarding matters of public moment and, in later literature, figures prominently in connection with the administration of justice.

Social Life

It has already been stated that the foundation of the political and social structure in the Ṛig-Vedic age was the family. The members of a family lived in the same house. Houses in this age were presumably built of wood or reed. In every house there was a

fireplace (*agniśālā*), besides a sitting-room and apartments for the ladies. The master of the house was called *gṛihapati* or *dampati*. He was usually kind and affectionate, but occasional acts of cruelty are recorded. Thus we have the story of a father who blinded his son for his extravagance.

Families being patrilineal, people prayed for abundance of sons. The birth of daughters was not desired, but once born they were treated with kindness and consideration. Their education was not neglected, and some of them lived to compose hymns and rise to the rank of seers like Viśvavārā, Ghoshā and Apālā. Girls were given in marriage when they attained full development. Marriage for love as well as for money was known. Weddings were celebrated in the house of the bride's parents. Ordinarily a man married but one wife. Polygamy was, however, practised, but not polyandry. Remarriage of widows was permitted. Women were not independent persons in the eye of the law, and had to look to their male relations for aid and support. Their position in the household was one of honour. The term *dampati* is sometimes used to designate the mistress as well as the master of the house. The wife participated in the religious offerings of the husband and was the queen of his home. There is no evidence in the *Ṛig-Veda* of the seclusion of women, and ladies trooped to festal gatherings "decked, shining forth with sunbeams".

Particular attention was paid to dress and adornment. The Vedic costume seems to have consisted of three parts—an undergarment styled *nīvi*, a garment called *vāsa* or *paridhāna* and a mantle styled *adhivāsa*, *atka* or *drāpi*. The clothes were of different hues and were made of cotton, deer skin or wool. Garments were often embroidered with gold. The use of gold ornaments and of floral wreaths was common, especially on festive occasions. Both the sexes wore turbans. The hair was worn long and combed. The long locks of women were folded in broad plaits.

The daily fare of the Vedic household consisted mainly of parched grain, cakes (*apūpa*), milk and its various products such as curd and butter, and many sorts of vegetables and fruits. The use of animal food was common, especially at the great feasts and family gatherings. The slaying of the cow was, however, gradually looked upon with disfavour as is apparent from the name *aghnyā* (not to be killed) applied to it in several passages. Curiously enough, we have no reference to the use of salt in the *Ṛig-Veda*.

Drinking water was obtained not only from rivers and springs (*utsa*), but also from *avatas* or artificial wells from which it was raised by a wheel of stone and poured into buckets of wood.

Reference is also made to more exhilarating drinks such as *Soma* and *Surā*. The former was the juice of a famous plant that grew on mountains, especially on the *Mūjavat* peak of the Himālayas. It was identical with the *Haoma* of the *Avesta*. Its use was restricted to religious ceremonies. On the other hand *Surā* was an ordinary intoxicating drink, the use of which was condemned in later ages.

The favourite amusements of the more virile classes were racing, hunting and the war-dance. The chariot-race was extremely popular and formed an important element of the sacrifice celebrated in later times as the *Vājapeya*. No less popular was hunting. The animals hunted were the lion, the elephant, the wild boar, the buffalo, and deer. Birds also were hunted. Another favourite pastime was dicing, which frequently entailed considerable loss to the gamester. Among other amusements, mention may be made of boxing, dancing and music. Women in particular loved to display their skill in dancing and singing to the accompaniment of lutes and cymbals. Lute-players played an important part in the development of the epic in later ages.

The Vedic singers loved to dwell on the joys of life and seldom referred to death except in the case of enemies. When a man died, he was either cremated or buried. The burning of widows does not appear to have been prevalent.

The Vedic *Kulas* or families were grouped into larger units in the formation of which *Varṇa* (colour) and *Sājātya* (kinship) played an important part. From the beginning, the white-hued (*śvitnya*) Aryan invaders were marked out from their dark-skinned opponents, who were called *dāsa*, *dasyu* or *śūdra*. In the Aryan community itself men of kingly family (*rājanya* or *kshatra*) and descendants of priests (*Brāhmaṇas*) were clearly distinguished from the common free men, the *viś*. The quadruple division of society is mentioned in some of the earlier hymns, but it makes its formal appearance in the *Purushasūkta* which seeks to explain the existing divisions by adumbrating the theory that "when they divided the primeval being (*Purusa*) the *Brāhmaṇa* was his mouth, the *Rājanya* became his arms, the *Vaiśya* was his thighs, and from his feet sprang the *Śūdras*".

The social divisions mentioned here have their parallel in other Indo-European communities. But it is important to remember that in the hymns of the *Ṛig-Veda* there is little trace of the rigid restrictions typical of caste in its mature form. There was hardly any taboo on intermarriage, change of occupation or commensality. We have instances of marriages of *Brāhmaṇas* with *Rājanya* women, and of the union of *Ārya* and *Śūdra*. Families were not wedded to

a particular profession. "I am," says the author of a hymn, "a poet, my father is a doctor, and my mother is a grinder of corn. With our different views, seeking after gain, we run, as after cattle." There was no ban on the taking of food cooked by the *Śūdras*, and there is no evidence that impurity was communicated by the touch or contact of the inferior castes.

The rigid restrictions with regard to occupation, commensality, etc., originated, according to recent writers, not with the Aryans but with the totemistic proto-Australoid and the Austro-Asiatic inhabitants of pre-Dravidian India who dreaded the magical effects of the practice of strange crafts and the taking of tabooed food. A taboo on intermarriage is also traced to a similar source. The Aryan invader, with his ideas about colour and hypergamy, simply crystallised and perpetuated a system which was already in existence and was based on the taboo arising from magical ideas. Other factors, geographical, economic, and religious, have had their share in later developments.

In later ages, a member of each of the three higher castes, who wished to lead an ideal life, had to pass through the rigorous discipline of the *Āśramas* or the four stages of life. First he was a *brahmachārin* or Vedic student vowed to chastity, then a *gṛihastha* or married householder, next a *vānaprastha* or forest hermit, and finally a *sannyāsin*, that is, an ascetic who had renounced the world. The germ of the system of *Āśrama* is already met with in the Vedic hymns. Besides the *gṛihapati*, we have reference to the *brahmachārin* as well as the *muni*. The *brahmachārin* practised self-restraint and studied the sacred lore. "The master recited the texts and the disciple repeated them after him as frogs croak one after another." The *munis* are described as "long-haired, some were wind-clad, others wore a soiled garment of brown colour and led a life of wandering".

Economic Life

The Ṛig-Vedic Aryans were mostly scattered in villages. The word *nagara* (city) does not occur in the hymns. We find indeed mention of *purs* which were occasionally of considerable size and were sometimes made of stone (*aśmamayī*) or of iron (*āyasī*). Some were furnished with a hundred walls (*śatabhuji*). But the *purs* were in all probability rather ramparts or forts than cities, and served as places of refuge, particularly in autumn, as is suggested by the epithet *Śāradī* applied to them in some passages. It is significant that, unlike the later texts, the *Ṛig-Veda* makes no clear mention of individual cities like Āsandivat or Kāmpila.

Regarding the organisation of the village we have a few details. There was an official styled the *Grāmanī* who looked after the affairs of the village, both civil and military. We have also reference to a functionary called *Vrājapati* who may have been identical with the *Grāmanī*, and who led to battle the various *Kulapas* or heads of families.

Homestead and arable lands in the village appear to have been owned by individuals or families, while grass lands (*khilya*) were probably held in common.

Agriculture was the principal occupation of the village folk. The importance of the art of tilling is clearly brought out by the name *Kṛishṭi* or *Charshaṇi* (agriculturist) which is applied to people in general, and in particular to the five principal tribes into which the early Vedic community was divided. Cultivated fields were known as *Urvarā* or *Kshetra*. They were often watered by irrigation canals. The use of manure was also known. The grain grown on the soil was styled *dhāna* or *yava*, but the exact significance of these terms in the earliest literature is not known. In later times they meant rice and barley. When ripe, they were cut with a sickle, tied in bundles and threshed on the floor of the granary. They were next winnowed, ground in the mill and made into cakes (*apūpa*).

The rearing of cattle and other domestic animals was scarcely less important than agriculture. Cows were held in much esteem, and milk, as we have seen, formed an important part of the dietary in the Vedic household. Herds of cattle were daily led to the pasture by the *gopa* (cowherd). The valley of the *Yamunā* was especially famous for its wealth of kine. The marking of the ears of cattle was a common practice, as is shown by the use of the expression *ashṭakarṇī* (having pierced ears or having the sign of 8 marked on the ear) to mean a cow.

Other useful animals were the draught-ox, the horse, the dog, the goat and the sheep. The ewes of the land of Gandhāra were famous for their wool.

Though mainly an agricultural and pastoral people, the Vedic tribes were not indifferent to trade and industry. Commerce was largely in the hands of a people styled *Paṇi*, who were probably non-Aryans and whose niggardliness was proverbial, but amongst them we have reference also to bountiful merchants like Bṛibu. Trade probably consisted mainly of barter. The chief articles of trade, judging by the evidence of the later *Saṁhitās*, were clothes, coverlets and skins. The standard unit of value was the cow, but necklets of gold (*nishka*) also served as a means of exchange. Whether *nishkas* in the early period possessed all the characteristic

marks of a regular coinage, is a highly debatable question. No gold coin of the old indigenous type has yet been discovered in India, but the transition to the use of coined money was clearly prepared by the *nishka*, which was a piece of metal that came to possess a definite weight, if not the hall-mark of State authority. We have also in the *Rig-Veda*, in an enumeration of gifts, reference to the golden *manā* which some authorities identify with the old Babylonian weight-unit, the *manah* (Latin *Mina*).

The principal means of transport by land were chariots (*ratha*) and wagons (*anas*), the former usually drawn by horses and the latter by oxen. The epithet *pathi-krit*, "path-maker", applied to the Fire-God, suggests that the services of the deity were frequently requisitioned to burn the primeval forests, infested by wild animals and haunted by highwaymen (*taskara*, *stena*), to make roads for the use of travellers and merchants.

A great controversy has centred round the question as to whether marine navigation was practised in Rig-Vedic times. According to one view, navigation was limited to the crossing of rivers in boats, but we have undoubted references to navigators sailing in ships with a hundred oars. In the story of the shipwreck of Bhujyu, mention is made of the *Samudra*, "which giveth no support, or hold, or station". Some think that *Samudra* means no more than the stream of the Indus in its lower course. Others regard the story as a matter of hearsay knowledge gathered from travellers, but acquaintance with the sea is rendered probable by references to the "treasures of the deep". If the identification of the Vedic *manā* with the Babylonian *manah* is correct, we have indubitable testimony to a very early intercourse between Vedic India and distant lands beyond the seas.

Of the industries of the Ṛig-Vedic period, those of the wood-worker, the metal-worker, the tanner, the weaver and the potter deserve special mention. The wood-worker or carpenter not only made chariots, wagons, houses and boats, but showed his skill in carved work of a finer type such as artistic cups. The metal-worker or smith fashioned all sorts of weapons, implements and ornaments from various kinds of metal including gold and the mysterious *ayas*, which some authorities take to mean copper or bronze while others favour the sense of iron. Workers in leather made water-casks, bow-strings, slings and hand-guards for the protection of the archers. Weavers included men as well as women. The latter showed their skill in sewing, weaving and the plaiting of mats from grass or reeds. The potter (*Kulāla*) also plied his craft for the benefit of the people.

Arts and Sciences

The art of poetry was in full bloom as is evidenced by the splendid collection of lyrics known as the *Ṛik-Saṁhitā* which consists of hymns in praise of different gods. The number of hymns is 1,017. These are grouped into books termed *ashṭakas* or *maṇḍalas* containing eight and ten hymns respectively, which were recited by priests styled *hotṛis* or reciters. The old hymns are chiefly to be found in the so-called Family Books (II–VII), each of which is ascribed by tradition to a particular family of seers (*ṛishis*). Their names are Gṛitsamada, Viśvāmitra, Vāmadeva, Atri, Bharadvāja and Vasishṭha. Book VIII is ascribed to the Kanvas and Angirases. Book IX is dedicated to *Soma*. The latest parts of the collection are to be found in Books I and X, which, however, contain some old hymns as well.

Fine specimens of lyric poetry are to be found among the Ṛig-Vedic hymns, notably in those addressed to the Goddess of the Dawn.

A knowledge of the art of writing has been deduced from references to *ashṭakarṇī* cows, where the epithet *ashṭa-karṇī* is interpreted to mean "having the sign for the number 8 marked on the ear". But the expression admits of other interpretations. The prevailing view has been that the Ṛig-Vedic people did not possess the art of writing, and that the old script in which the inscriptions of Aśoka and his successors are written goes back to a Semitic, and not Vedic Aryan, origin. Writing was no doubt practised by the pre-historic people of the Indus valley who developed the ancient culture of Harappā and Mohenjo-Daro, but it is significant that the early literature of the Aryans was transmitted orally.

Architecture made some advance in Ṛig-Vedic India. There are references to mansions supported by a thousand columns and provided with a thousand doors. Mention is also made of stone castles and structures with a hundred walls. Allusions to images of Indra possibly point, according to some, to the beginnings of sculpture.

The medical art of the age distinguished quite a number of diseases. But the physician (*bhishaj*) was still a fiend-slayer as well as a healer of disease, and charms and spells were regarded as equally efficacious with healing herbs and drugs. The use of iron legs as a substitute for natural ones points, however, to some advance in surgery. The science of astronomy made definite progress, and certain stars had already been observed and named.

Religion

The early Vedic religion has been designated by the name of henotheism or kathenotheism—a belief in single gods, each in turn standing out as the highest. It has also been described as the worship of Nature leading up to Nature's God. The chief deities of the earlier books owe their origin to the personification of natural phenomena. Abstract deities like *Dhātṛi*, the Establisher; *Vidhātṛi*, the Ordainer; *Viśvakarman*, the All-Creating, and *Prajāpati*, the Lord of Creatures, *Śraddhā*, Faith; *Manyu*, Wrath, make their appearance at a later stage. Besides the higher Gods, lauded by priests, we have reference to others whose worship was not countenanced in orthodox circles. Some scholars find in the hymns traces of the cult of the *liṇga*, and even of Kṛishṇa. Śiva occurs as an epithet of the god Rudra worshipped by the Vedic priests. The Kṛishṇa mentioned in Ṛig-Vedic hymns can hardly be identified with his epic and Purāṇic namesake, as the river with which he is associated in the *Ṛig-Veda* is not the Jumnā but some stream in the Kuru country, as we learn from the *Bṛihaddevatā*.

Father *Dyaus* (Zeus, Diespiter), the Shining God of Heaven, and Mother *Pṛithivī*, the Earth Goddess, are among the oldest of the Vedic deities, but the hymns scarcely reflect their former greatness. They have been cast into the shade by *Varuṇa*, the Encompassing Sky, and Indra, the God of Thunder and Rain. Varuṇa is the most sublime deity of the early Vedic pantheon. He bears the epithet *Asura* (Avestan *Ahura*) and he is the great upholder of physical and moral order, *Ṛita*, the idea of which is at least as old as the fourteenth century B.C., as we learn from inscriptions mentioning the names of the Mitanni kings. To Varuṇa people turned for forgiveness of sin just as they did to Vishṇu in a later age.

"If we have sinned against the man who loves us, have ever wronged a brother, friend, comrade,
The neighbour ever with us, or a stranger, O Varuṇa, remove from us the trespass.

"O Varuṇa, whatever the offence may be which we as men commit against the heavenly host,
When through our want of strength we violate thy laws, punish us not, O God, for that iniquity."

The worship of Varuṇa, with its consciousness of sin and trust in the divine forgiveness, is undoubtedly one of the first roots of the later doctrine of *Bhakti*.

If Varuṇa is the sovereign of the Universe and the guardian of the moral laws, Indra is the puissant God of war, the lightning-wielder, who

". . . slew the serpent, then discharged the waters,
And cleft the caverns of the lofty mountains",
". . . made all earthly things unstable,
Who humbled and dispersed the Dāsa colour,
Who, as the player's stake the winning gambler,
The foemen's fortune gains. . . ."

Indra came to occupy the chief place among the Vedic gods, while Varuṇa receded to the background and became merely the Lord of Waters, a sort of Indian Neptune.

Closely connected with Varuṇa is Mitra, the friend, the personification of the sun's beneficent agency, and the two belonged to the class of deities styled *Āditya*, sons of Aditi, the Goddess of Eternity. Other important deities of the upper realm of light are *Sūrya*, the Illuminator; *Savitṛi*, the Enlivener; *Pūshan*, the Nourisher, *Vishṇu Urukrama*, the wide-striding Sun; the *Aśvins* or the *Nāsatyas*, perhaps the Morning and Evening Stars, later the gods of healing, parallel to the *Dioscuri*; and *Ushas*, the lovely Goddess of the Dawn.

Between the world of light above and the earth below lies the realm of the air, and the chief deities of this region are, besides Indra, the *Maruts* (Storm Gods), *Vāyu* and *Vāta* (the Wind Gods), *Rudra* (the Howling God of Storm and Lightning), and *Parjanya* (the God of Rain). Of the terrestrial deities, the chief are Agni, Soma and Sarasvatī. *Agni*, or the Fire-God, received special homage because no sacrifice could be performed without offerings to him. The libation of *Soma* was also regarded as specially sacred. *Sarasvatī* was a river deity who came to be regarded later as the Goddess of Learning. Of the three principal deities of the later mythology, Vishṇu and Rudra (Śiva) are, as we have seen already, known to the *Ṛig-Veda*, and Brahmā, though not explicitly mentioned, has his precursors in Vidhātṛi (the Ordainer), Hiraṇyagarbha (the Germ of Gold), Prajāpati (the Lord of Creatures) and Brahmanaspati (the Lord of Prayer).

An important characteristic of Vedic Mythology is the predominance of the male element. Goddesses like Pṛithivī, Aditi, Ushas, and Sarasvatī occupy a very subordinate position. In this respect the Vedic civilisation presents a contrast to the prehistoric culture of the Indus valley, where the Mother Goddess is co-equal with her male partner.

Another important feature of the Vedic religion is the tendency towards monotheism and even monism. The hymns foreshadow the idea of universal unity, and express the belief that God is One although he bears many names.

> "They call him Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa,
> And Agni; he is the heavenly bird Garutmat:
> To what is One, the poets give many a name,
> They call it Agni, Yama, Mātariśvan."

The monotheistic conception appears more prominently in the hymns addressed to Hiraṇyagarbha (the Gold Germ), and to Viśvakarman (the All-Creating),

> "Who is our Father, our Creator, Maker,
> Who every place doth know and every creature,
> By Whom alone to gods their names were given,
> To Him all other creatures go, to ask Him."

Finally, we have a song of Creation according to which in the beginning

> ". . . neither death nor deathlessness existed;
> Of day and night there was yet no distinction.
> Alone that One breathed calmly, self-supported,
> Other than It was none, nor aught above It."

Sacrifices occupy a prominent place in the Vedic ritual. These include offerings of milk, grain, *ghee*, flesh and juice of the Soma plant. The use of material objects as symbols of deities was perhaps not altogether unknown, and one passage apparently makes a reference to an image or symbol of Indra. The symbol of phallic worship is, as we have seen, detected by some in the allusions to the *Śiśnadevas*.

Regarding life after death, the Ṛig-Vedic hymns have no consistent theory. According to some passages, the dead dwell in the realm of Yama, the beneficent king of the departed. The idea of metempsychosis is, however, not yet developed.

CHAPTER IV

LATER VEDIC CIVILISATION

Aryan Expansion

We have seen that in the Ṛig-Vedic period the Aryan tribes had spread over the whole country from the Kābul to the upper Ganges, and had built up small kingdoms mostly under hereditary monarchs who held their own against the non-Aryan peoples by whom they were surrounded. But internecine strife in which some of the tribes engaged even in Rig-Vedic times produced far-reaching results. Some of the weaker tribes were absorbed by their more powerful neighbours, and the increase in the wealth and territory of the conquering tribes was reflected in the growth of the power of the kings, who governed large and compact kingdoms. Stately cities made their appearance for the first time in the later Vedic texts.

Simultaneously with the growth of large kingdoms, we have a further extension of the political and cultural sway of the Aryans towards the east and the south. This was due as much to the adventurous spirit of kings and princes as to the desire of the priests to cause *Agni*, the Fire-God, to taste new lands through sacrifices. Before the close of the later Vedic period, the Aryans had thoroughly subdued the fertile plains watered by the Jumnā, the upper Ganges and the *Sadānīrā* (the Rāptī or the Gaṇḍak). Adventurous bands penetrated into the Vindhyan forest and established powerful kingdoms in the Deccan to the north of the Godāvarī.

The centre of the Aryan world was the "firm middle country" (*dhruvā madhyamā diś*) stretching from the Sarasvatī to the Gangetic Doāb and occupied by the Kurus, the Pañchālas and some adjoining tribes. It was from this region that Brāhmaṇical civilisation spread to the outer provinces, to the land of the Kosalas and the Kāsis drained by the *Sarayū* and the *Varaṇāvatī*, to the swamps east of the Gaṇḍak colonised by the Videhas, and to the valley of the Wardha occupied by the Vidarbhas. Beyond them lived the tribes of mixed origin like the Aṅgas of East Bihār and the

Magadhas of South Bihār, as well as *Dasyus* or aboriginal folk like the Puṇḍras of North Bengal, the Pulindas and Śavaras of the Vindhyan forest, and the Andhras in the valley of the Godāvarī.

The most distinguished among the tribes of the period were at first the Kurus and the Pañchālas with their capitals at Āsandīvat and Kāmpila (Kāmpilya) respectively. The former occupied Kurukshetra—the tongue of land between the Sarasvatī and the Dṛishadvatī (Chitang–Rakshi)—as well as the districts of Delhi and Meerut. The latter occupied the Bareilly, Budāūn and Farrukhābād districts of the United Provinces and some adjoining tracts. The Kuru nation was probably formed by the amalgamation of several smaller tribes including a section of the Pūrus and the Bharatas, while the Pañchālas sprang from an obscure Ṛig-Vedic tribe known as the Krivis, with whom were associated the Sṛiñjavas and the Turvaśas.

The later Vedic texts mention powerful Kuru kings like Balhika-Pratipīya, Parikshit and Janamejaya, all of whom figure prominently in epic legends. Parikshit is the hero of a famous song of praise found in the *Atharva Veda*. It describes him as a universal king (*rājā viśvajanīna*) and his kingdom as flowing with milk and honey. His son Janamejaya is credited with having gone round the earth, completely conquering on every side. His successors were not so powerful as he was. They sustained disasters and were finally obliged to fly from Kurukshetra. According to later tradition a scion of the Kuru race transferred his residence to Kauśāmbī (Kosam, near Allahābād) and ruled over a powerful kingdom which survived till the rise of Buddhism.

The Pañchālas also produced conquering kings who engaged in wars and alliances with the Kurus. But their chief title to fame rests on their land being the home of theologians and philosophers like king Pravāhana-Jaivali and the sages Āruṇi and Śvetaketu.

In the time of the Upanishads the fame of the land of the Pañchālas as a centre of Brāhmanical learning was eclipsed by the country of the Videhas, whose king Janaka, the patron of Yājñavalkya, won the proud title of *Samrāṭ*. He gathered the celebrities of the Kuru-Pañchāla countries at his court "much as the intellects of Athens gathered at the Court of Macedonian princes". The Videhan monarchy fell shortly before the rise of Buddhism, and its overthrow was followed by the rise of the Vajjian Confederacy.

Growth of Royal Power and Elaboration of the Administrative Machinery

The amalgamation of tribes and the increase in the size of kingdoms in the later Vedic age, coupled with the successful leadership of the kings in war, inevitably led to a growth in the royal power. Kings now claimed to be absolute masters of all their subjects, excepting perhaps the Brāhmaṇas who proclaimed Soma to be their king. But even the Brāhmaṇas were "liable to removal at will". The common free men had to pay tribute (*bali*, *śulka* and *bhāga*) and could be "oppressed at will", while the members of the servile classes were liable to be "expelled and slain at will".

The chief functions of the king were of a military and judicial character. He was the protector of his people and the laws, and the destroyer of their enemies. Himself immune from punishment, he wielded the rod of chastisement (*daṇḍa*).

Successful monarchs set up claims to the rank of universal king (*rājā viśvajanīna*), lord of all the earth (*sarvabhūmi*) or sole ruler (*ekarāṭ*) of the land down to the seas, and celebrated sacrifices befitting their status like the *Rājasūya* (royal consecration), the *Vājapeya* (drink of strength) and *Aśvamedha* (horse-sacrifice). The *Rājasūya* included offerings to divinities in the houses of officials, styled *ratnins*, and a formal *abhisheka* or besprinkling by the priest, besides certain popular rites such as a cow raid, a sham fight and a game of dice in which the king is made to be the victor. The most interesting feature of the *Vājapeya* rites was a chariot-race in which the sacrificer was allowed to carry off the palm. This was followed by homage to Mother Earth and a formal enthronement. In the *Aśvamedha* ceremonial, a horse was set free to roam abroad under the guardianship of youths of rank who were fully armed. If the period of wandering were successfully passed, the steed was sacrificed. The features of the rite included a circle of tales narrated by a priest, and laudatory verses sung by a lute-player.

While the kings of the middle country were generally content with the title of *rājā*, rulers in the outlying parts of India preferred other designations. The eastern kings were styled *Samrāṭ*, the southerners *Bhoja*, those in the west *Svarāṭ*, while the rulers of the northern realms (*janapadas*) were called *Virāṭ*. The association of the *Samrāṭ*, whose status was now regarded as higher than that of the *rājan*, with the east is important. It probably points to the growth of imperialism in the east—a tendency that became more marked in the early days of Buddhism.

The king was usually, though not invariably, a Kshatriya. The office of monarch now, as before, was normally hereditary, though cases of election by the people were probably not rare, as is apparent from the coronation songs of the *Atharva Veda*. But popular choice seems to have been generally limited to members of the royal family.

The royal claim to absolutism did not pass unchallenged. The ceremonial of consecration included certain rites which required the king to descend from the throne and make obeisance to the Brāhmaṇas. He had also to take an oath not to play false to the priest, and was specially charged with the duty of protecting the Brāhmaṇas and the laws of the realm. That the Brāhmaṇas did not tamely acquiesce in all that the king did, appears from several stories about the conflict of kings and Brāhmaṇas recorded in the later Vedic texts. As to the commonalty, they supplied important officials like the *Sūta* and the *Grāmanī*, whose title *rājā kartṛi* or "king-maker" indicated their importance in the body politic. The popular assemblies styled the *Sabhā* and the *Samiti* were still regarded as important, and it is stated in the *Atharva Veda* that concord between the king and the assembly was essential for the former's prosperity. Popular wrath vented itself in the expulsion of tyrannical kings together with erring officials.

With the growth of royal power came an elaboration of the machinery of administration. In the Ṛig-Vedic period we have, barring the *Purohita* (chaplain), scarcely any reference to a purely civil functionary among the higher officials of the king. But in the later Vedic texts we come across the *Samgrahitṛi* (treasurer), the *Bhāgadugha* (collector of taxes), the *Sūta* (royal herald, bard or charioteer), the *Kshattṛi* (Chamberlain), the *Akshāvāpa* (superintendent of gambling), the *Go-vikartana* (king's companion in the chase), the *Pālāgala* (courier), in addition to the older ecclesiastical and military officials like the *Purohita* (chaplain), the *Senānī* (general) and the *Grāmanī* (leader of the host or of the village). Mention is also made of the generic title *Sachiva* applied to ministers in later ages. The references to the *Samgrahitṛi* and the *Bhāgadugha*, coupled with the mention of regular contributions from the people in the shape of *bali* and *śulka*, point to important developments in the system of taxation and revenue administration.

The beginnings of a regular system of provincial government may be traced in references to the *Sthapati* and the *Śatapati*. The former was apparently charged with the duty of administering outlying areas often inhabited by aboriginal tribes, while the latter probably looked after a group of a hundred villages and was

the precursor of the long chain of rural officials mentioned in the law-books. On the lowest rung of the ladder stood the village officials (*adhikṛita*) appointed by the king himself according to the *Praśna Upanishad*. Regarding police arrangements, we know very little. Some find a reference to police officials in the *Jīvagribh* of the Ṛig-Veda and the *Ugras* of the Upanishads. But the matter is not free from doubt.

The king had a very large part in the administration of justice, but power was sometimes delegated to *Adhyakshas* or overseers. Certain cases were referred to the tribe for adjudication. The judicial work of the tribal assembly was usually entrusted to a small body of *Sabhāsads* or assessors. Petty cases in the village were decided by the *Grāmyavādin* or village judge and his court (*Sabhā*). The use of Ordeal as a part of judicial procedure was not unknown. Civil cases were sometimes decided by arbitration, and private vengeance in criminal cases was still recognised.

Social Changes

Little change can be traced in the mode of house-building and the style of dress. In regard to dietary, the eating of meat was being looked upon with disfavour. New forms of social entertainment had come into existence. We have references to the *Śailūsha* or actor, and *gāthās* or verses were sung by the lute-players (*vīṇāgāthin*) at great public festivals to the accompaniment of musical instruments which were sometimes furnished with a hundred strings (*śata-tantu*). Such *gāthās* foreshadow the "songs of victory" which developed into the Great Epic.

In regard to the position of women, there was hardly any improvement. Daughters were regarded as a source of misery. Women could not go to the tribal council or assembly (*Sabhā*), neither could they take an inheritance. Married women of the upper classes had often to suffer the presence of rival wives. The lot of queens was specially unenviable in this respect. While some of them, e.g. the *mahishī* or chief queen, and the *vāvātā* or the favourite, were loved and honoured, others like the *parivrikti* were admittedly neglected. But they continued to have their share in religious rites. The education which some of them received was of a high order, as it enabled them to take a prominent part in philosophical disputations at royal courts. The rules of marriage underwent a change towards greater rigidity, and there were instances of child marriage.

As regards class distinction, changes of far-reaching importance

were taking place. The two higher classes, namely the Brāhmaṇa and the Kshatriya, enjoyed privileges denied to the Vaiśya and the Śūdra. The latter could be "oppressed at will". Different modes of address were laid down for the four castes. Change of caste was becoming difficult, if not impossible, but the higher classes were still free to intermarry with the lower orders, though marriage with Śūdras was not much approved. The life of a member of the higher castes was now rigidly regulated. The *Chāndogya Upanishad* makes pointed reference to three stages, that of the householder engaged in sacrifice, study and charity, that of the hermit who practised austerity, and that of the Brahmachārin who dwelt with his *Āchārya* or teacher. The power and prestige of the Brāhmaṇas had increased immensely. But though the priest claimed to be a god on earth and the protector of the realm, and the same individual might be the *Purohita* of several kingdoms, there was no pope to oppose the king. The Brāhmaṇa claim to supremacy was now and then contested by the Kshatriya, and we have declarations to the effect that the Kshatriya had no superior and that the priest was only a follower of the king. The great community of ordinary freemen was splitting up into small functional groups and we have references, in addition to those engaged in agricultural and pastoral pursuits, to the merchant, the chariot-maker, the smith, the carpenter, the tanner, the fisherman, etc., as names of distinct castes. Some of them were sinking in social estimation, and in a Brāhmaṇa passage a carpenter's touch is said to impart ceremonial impurity. The Śūdra, too, was regarded as impure and was not allowed to touch the milk needed for oblations to the Fire-God. The gulf separating him from the humbler freeman was, however, becoming narrower. He was not infrequently grouped with the Vaiśya, and the two together were set against the priest and the noble. The right of the Śūdra to live and prosper was gradually recognised and prayers were even uttered for his glory. The ranks of Śūdras were constantly swelled by the admission of new aboriginal tribes into the Aryan polity.

Outside the regular castes stood two important bodies of men, namely, the *Vrātyas* and the *Nishādas*. The *Vrātyas* were probably Aryans outside the pale of Brāhmaṇism. They did not observe Brāhmaṇic rules, spoke some Prākritic language and led a nomadic life. They appear to have had some special connection with the people of Magadha and the cult of Śiva and of the "Arhats". They were permitted to become members of the Brāhmaṇical community by the performance of some prescribed rites.

The *Nishādas* were clearly a non-Aryan people who lived in their own villages and had their own rulers (*Sthapati*). They were probably identical with the modern Bhīls.

Economic Condition

The people, including even men of wealth, still lived mostly in villages, but the amenities of city life were no longer unknown. In certain villages peasant proprietors, working in their own fields, were being replaced by a class of landlords who obtained possession of entire villages. Transfer of land, however, did not meet with popular approval during this epoch, and allotments could only be made with the consent of clansmen.

Agriculture continued to be one of the principal occupations of the people. Considerable improvement was effected in agricultural implements, and new kinds of grain and fruit trees were grown on the soil. But the cultivator was not free from trouble, and an *Upanishad* passage refers to a hailstorm or a swarm of locusts that sadly afflicted the land of the Kurus and forced many people to leave the country. Trade and industry flourished. A class of hereditary merchants (*vāṇija*) came into being. There was inland trade with the Kirātas inhabiting the mountains, who apparently exchanged the drugs which they dug up on the high ridges for clothes, mattresses, and skins. The sea was known intimately, and the mention of the legend of the flood in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* is taken by some authorities to point to intercourse with Babylon. Commerce was facilitated by the use of convenient units of value like the *nishka*, the *śatamāna*, and the *kṛishṇala*, but it is doubtful if these had acquired all the characteristics of a regular coinage. The *nishka*, formerly a necklet, was now probably a lump of gold possessing a definite weight equal to three hundred and twenty *ratis* (1 *rati* = 18 grams), which was also the weight of a *śatamāna*. A *kṛishṇala* weighed one *rati*, that is, 1·8 grains. Merchants were probably organised into guilds, as appears from references to *gaṇas* or corporations and the *śreshṭhins* or aldermen.

The variety of industrial occupations was remarkable. Specialisation had gone far. The chariot-maker was distinguished from the carpenter, the maker of the bows from the maker of the bow-strings and of arrows, the tanner from the hide-dresser or furrier. Women took part in industrial life as makers of embroidered garments, workers in thorns, dyers, etc.

Religious Development

Great changes took place in the religious life of the people. The lustre of the older gods was gradually dimmed, though one would still find, here and there, especially in the *Atharva Veda*, magnificent hymns celebrating the omniscience of *Varuṇa* or the beneficence of the Earth-Goddess. The sacrificial side of religion was greatly developed by the priests, while the popular superstitious belief in spirits, imps, spells, incantations and witchcraft found a place in the sacred canon. The monotheistic and monistic tendencies, that showed themselves prominently towards the close of the Ṛig-Vedic period, became more marked with the efflux of time. *Prajāpati*, the lord of created beings, cast all the older deities into the shade. The germ of the later doctrine of the *Avatāras*, or divine "descents" or incarnations, can be traced in stories about *Prajāpati* assuming the form of a boar to raise the earth from the primeval waters and becoming a tortoise when about to create offspring. While the priests and the theologians were absorbed in elaborate sacrificial rites and muttered litanies in honour of *Prajāpati*, the First Sacrificer and the Embodiment of Sacrifice, philosophers threw doubts on the efficacy of ritual, speculated about the underlying unity of the universe, and strove for union with the supreme *Brahman* or *Paramātman*, the universal Soul or the Absolute "that dwelleth in every thing, that guideth all beings within, the Inward Guide, Immortal".

The common people, however, did not understand abstruse theological or philosophical speculations and began to show predilection for certain deities already known to the *Ṛig-Veda* but not so prominent as Indra or Varuṇa. One of them was Rudra, who already bore in the early litanies the epithet of *Śiva* (propitious) and soon came to be regarded as the Great God (*Mahādeva*) and the lord of animate beings (*Paśupati*). His popularity may have been due to his identification with the chief male deity of the pre-historic people of the Indus.

Side by side with Rudra arose another figure—Vishnu, a solar deity famed in the *Ṛig-Veda* for his three strides. As the source of cosmic and moral order, the deliverer of mankind in distress and saviour of the Gods, Vishṇu soon came to occupy the place of Varuna as the most sublime among the celestials, and his highest step (*paramampadam*) became the goal of sages and seers. Before the final close of the Vedic canon, he came to be identified with *Vāsudeva*—a hero or demi-god known to epic tradition as Kṛishṇa-Devakīputra. In one Upanishad we find Kṛishṇa associated with

a school of thought that rejected the purely ritualistic interpretation of sacrifice and considered the practice of virtue to be as effective as gifts to priests. In the final hour one should, according to this school, take refuge in these three thoughts: "You are the imperishable, the never-falling and the very essence of life." The goal of spiritual endeavour according to them, was the realm of light higher than heaven where dwelleth the God among the gods. Here we see the germ of some of the doctrines that received a more systematic treatment in later ages and lay at the root of the Bhāgavata creed.

Literature and Science

Before the close of the Vedic period, the Aryans possessed an extensive literature handed down in the Brāhmaṇical schools by memory. Some idea of the wide range of subjects in which the people interested themselves may be obtained from several lists given in the *Upanishads*. One such list makes mention not only of the *Vedas* but of *Itihāsa-purāṇa* (legend and ancient lore), *Pitrya* (the science relating to the Manes), *Rāśi* (mathematics), *Daiva* (knowledge of portents), *Nidhi* (chronology), *Vākovākya* (dialectics), *Ekāyana* (ethics), *Deva-vidyā* (etymological interpretation of divine names), *Brahmavidyā* (knowledge of the Absolute), *Bhūtavidyā* (demonology, or science of elements), *Kshatra vidyā* (the military science), *Nakshatra vidyā* (astronomy), *Sarpa vidyā* (the science of snakes), and *Devajana vidyā* (dancing and music or mythology). Another list mentions the *Vedas*, phonetics (*śikshā*), ritual (*kalpa*), grammar (*vyākaraṇa*), etymology (*nirukta*), metrics (*chhandas*) and astronomy (*jyotisha*). If all the subjects mentioned in the former list were dealt with in special treatises, most of them have not come down to us. A brief account of the extant works of Vedic literature included in the second list is given below.

The word *Veda* comes from the root *vid*, to know. It means knowledge in general. It is specially applied to a branch of literature which has been handed down from time immemorial by verbal transmission and is declared to be sacred knowledge or divine revelation (*Sruti*).

The Veda consists of four different classes of literary compositions:

(1) The *Mantra* (saying, song, formula) constitutes the oldest division of Vedic literature, and is distributed in four *Saṁhitās* or collections known as the *Ṛik*, *Sāma*, *Yajus*, and *Atharva Saṁhitās*. The first three are sometimes spoken of as the *Trayī*

70°
80°
30°
20°
10°
70°
KETUMALA
SOGDIANA
PAMIRS
R. Vakshu
VALHIKA
BACTRIANA
ARRIA
ARACHOSIA
R. Helmund
Kapisa
Kabul
Alexan
R. Kubha
GANDHARA
Taxila
JAGUDA
R. Krumu
R. Gomati
KEKAYA
R. Vitasta
Srinagar
Chandrabhaga
Sialkot
R. Vipasa
Trigarta
R. Iravati
R. Satadru
MADRA
Multan
Harappa
YAUDHEYA
BRAHMAVARTA
R. Drishadvati
Suvihar
R. Sindhu
SINDHU
R. Sarasvati
SUDRAS
GEDROSIA
Barbaricum
Bahmanabad
Thar Desert
NISHADAS
R. Parnasa
GURJARA
KACHCHHA
ANARTA
Dwaraka
Girnar h. ll.
Junagadh
SURASHTRA
Valabhi
Diu I.
Surparaka
APARA MALAVA
R. Mahi
Dasapura
MARU
KURUKSHETRA
Matsya
SURASENA
Mathura
Govisana
Matipur
Indraprastha
PANCHALA
KURU JANGALA
USHKARA
RUANTARVEDI
Nandi
Kausami
NAGAS
Akara
Dhanapala
AVANTI
Ujjayini
Bhilsa
Tumbavana
ANUPA
DANDAKA
VIDARBHA
ASHTRIKAS
ATAKAS
MULAKA
Paithan
Junnar
Kanheri (Bombay)
Elephanta (Gharapuri)
R. Manjira
R. Bhimarathi
DAKSHINAPATHA
R. Krishna
R. Tungabhadra
KUNTALA
Banavasi (Vaijayanti)
R. Pinaka
GANGAVADI
Sravan Belgola
Kanchi
R. Kaveri
Purnad
Kavirippaddinam
DRAVIDA
Laccadive Islands
DAMIRICA
Muziris
Uraiyur
CHOLA
R. Kritamala
Madura
PANDYA
Rameswaram
Kayal
Korkai
Tamraparni R.
CEYLON
PASCHIMA PAYODHI
DAKSHINA

ANCIENT INDIA
(BHARATA-VARSHA)
Kilometres
100 200 300 400 500 600 700 800
90°
100°
30°
20°
10°
RANGE
PUNDRA
VARDHANA
VARENDRI
ANGA
GAUDA
RACHA
SUHMA
SAMATATA
UTKALA
PURVA
SAGARA
VARNA BHUMI
Andaman
Islands
Nicobar
Islands
JALANIDHI
Longitude East 90° of Greenwich
100°

or threefold knowledge, being alone recognised at first as canonical scriptures.

The *Ṛik-Saṁhitā* is a collection of lyrics in praise of different gods. These were recited by the priest styled the *hotṛi*. Most of the songs belong to an age anterior to what we have called the Later Vedic period, but the collection as a whole may not be so old. The *Saṁhitā* of the *Sāmaveda*, or the Book of Chants, contains hardly any independent matter, all its verses except seventy-five being taken directly from the *Ṛig-Veda*. Its songs were meant to be sung at the Soma sacrifice by a special class of priests called *Udgātṛi*. The *Saṁhitā* of the *Yajurveda*, or Book of Sacrificial Prayer, consists not only of stanzas taken from the *Ṛig-Veda*, but also of original prose formulas to be uttered by the *Adhvaryu* priest who performed the manual work involved in a sacrifice. The collection has two divergent texts, viz., (*a*) the *Saṁhitā* of the Black *Yajurveda* preserved in the *Taittirīya*, *Maitrāyanī* and *Kāṭhaka* recensions, and (*b*) the *Saṁhitā* of the White *Yajurveda* preserved in the *Vājasaneyī* recension.

At a time considerably later than the *Saṁhitās* mentioned above, a fourth attained to canonical recognition, the *Atharva Veda*, or the Book of Magic Formulas. Though its recognition came late, much of the matter contained in the collection is old. Some of the Atharvan hymns were of popular rather than priestly origin and may be as old as the earliest parts of the *Ṛig-Veda*. The *Atharva-Saṁhitā* is, in the main, a collection of songs, spells and incantations for the healing of disease, the restoration of harmony, the exorcism of evil spirits, etc. But there are certain hymns of rare beauty that celebrate the power and omniscience of God and the beneficence of Mother Earth.

> "May Earth pour out her milk for us,
> a mother unto me her son.
> O Pṛithivī, auspicious be thy woodlands,
> auspicious be thy hills and snow-clad mountains."

(2) The second class of Vedic works are known by the name of *Brāhmaṇas*, i.e. treatises relating to prayer and sacrificial ceremony. They are mainly prose texts containing observations on sacrifice. They also contain cosmogonic myths, old legends and *gāthās* or verses celebrating the exploits of kings famed in priestly tradition.

(3) Next come the *Āraṇyakas* or forest texts, books of instruction to be given in the forest or writings meant for wood-dwelling hermits, which are found as appendices to the *Brāhmaṇas*. These treatises resemble the *Brāhmaṇas* in language, style and even

content, but they are concerned more with the allegorical signification of rites, and the mystic meaning of the texts of the *Saṁhitās* than with elaborate rules for the performance of the great sacrifices. The bulk of the *Āraṇyaka* literature is old, but certain portions may belong to a date posterior to the period under review.

(4) Lastly we have the *Upanishads*, "secret or esoteric doctrines". The name is derived by some from the root *upa-ni-sad* which means "to sit down near some one" and is applied to doctrines that may be imparted to a son or a trusted pupil *seated near the teacher*. The Upanishads are either imbedded in the Āraṇyakas or form their supplements. They are also found as independent works. They contain deep speculations of a philosophical character which "revolve around the two conceptions of *Brahman* and *Ātman*", i.e. the universal soul, the Absolute and the individual self. The oldest Upanishads are usually regarded as pre-Buddhistic, but some of the treatises bearing the name "Upanishad" certainly belong to a much later period.

The classes of literary works named above are alone classed as *Śruti*, or Revelation, and constitute the Vedic literature proper. But closely connected with them as auxiliary treatises, though not regarded as a part of the Revelation, there exist a class of compositions called *Vedāṅga*, "members or limbs of the Veda". They are regarded as less authoritative than the Śruti, and are styled *Smṛiti*, memory or tradition, as handing down only the tradition derived from ancient sages to whom the Vedas were "revealed". They originated mostly in Vedic schools (*Charaṇas*) and their contents are often expressed in an extremely condensed style of prose intended for memorisation, to which the name *Sūtra* (thread, clue, guide, rule, aphorism) is given. Some of the treatises were versified in later times.

The *Vedāṅgas* are six in number, viz., *Śikshā* (phonetics), *Kalpa* (ritual), *Vyākaraṇa* (grammar), *Nirukta* (etymology), *Chhandas* (metrics), and *Jyotisha* (astronomy). These subjects are already mentioned in some of the *Upanishads*, though the extant manuals may belong to a much later period.

The manuals of *Śikshā* deal with the correct pronunciation and accentuation of the Vedic hymns. The productions of the Śikshā school include the "connected text" of the *Ṛig-Veda* as well as the "word-text" which gives the text of the verses in a complete grammatical analysis. But the most remarkable compositions of the Śikshā class are the *Prātisākhya Sūtras* which contain the rules by the aid of which the *Saṁhitā-pāṭha* (connected text) can be formed from the *Pada-pāṭha* (word-text).

The treatises on *Kalpa* or ritual include the *Śrauta Sūtras* which lay down rules for the performance of the great sacrifices, the *Gṛihya Sūtras* which give directions for the simple ceremonies of daily life, and the *Dharma Sūtras* which deal with sacred and secular law and administration. As integral parts of the *Śrauta Sūtras* are found compositions styled *Śulva Sūtras* which lay down rules for the measurement and building of the place of sacrifice and the fire-altars, and are the oldest treatises on Indian geometry.

There are manuals supplementary to the *Kalpa Sūtras* styled *Pariśishṭas* or addenda.

In *Vyākaraṇa*, *Nirukta* and *Chhandas* we have the great work of Pāṇini, Yāska, and Piṅgala. A metrical work on *Jyotisha Vedāṅga* is extant, but it seems to belong to a comparatively late date.

CHAPTER V

THE BEGINNINGS OF MAGADHAN ASCENDANCY AND THE COMING OF THE YAVANAS

The Great Janapadas

THE idea of a universal king was present before the minds of the Ṛig-Vedic poets, and in the later Vedic texts we find mention of several rulers who went round the "earth" conquering on every side. These conquests, however, did not normally involve a permanent annexation of the territories of the vanquished people, though minor tribes may now and then have been reduced to vassalage and governed by rulers (*sthapati*) appointed by the conquering *rājan* (king). But from the sixth century B.C. we can trace a new development in Indian politics. We have the growth of a number of powerful kingdoms in eastern India—the very region which in the Brāhmaṇa texts is associated with rulers consecrated to a superior kind of kingship, styled *sāmrājya*—which gradually absorbed the neighbouring states till at last one great monarchy swallowed up the rest and laid the foundations of an empire which ultimately stretched from the Hindukush to the northern districts of Mysore. But before we take up the history of this remarkable political transformation, it is necessary for us to note the changes in the map of India since the period of the Brāhmaṇas and the classical Upanishads.

The widest area known to the Aryans of the Brāhmaṇa period is that described in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*. The boundaries of the Aryan world stretched from the countries of the Uttara Kurus and the Uttara Madras beyond the Himālayas to the land of the Śatvats (and Bhojas), south of the Jumnā and the Chambal, and from the territory of the *Nīchyas* and *Apāchyas* in the west to the realm of the *Prāchyas* in the east. The exact position of the *Nīchyas* and *Apāchyas* cannot be determined. But the *Prāchyas* were doubtless the Prasii of Greek writers, i.e., the people of Magadha and the neighbouring provinces. Beyond Magadha lived the *Puṇḍras* of North Bengal and the *Vaṅgas* of central and eastern Bengal who were outside the pale of Aryandom. The Vaṅgas,

however, are not mentioned in the *Brāhmaṇa* proper but *possibly* in the *Āraṇyaka* attached to it. In the south, besides the Aryan realms of the Bhojas, we find the Andhras of the Godāvarī valley and some aboriginal tribes inhabiting the Vindhyan forests.

The later literature of the Brāhmaṇical Hindus and the sacred canon of the Buddhists introduce some new names, e.g. Kaliṅga on the east coast stretching from the Vaitaraṇī in Orissa to the neighbourhood of the Godāvarī, Aśmaka and Mūlaka on the Upper Godāvarī, Avanti in Mālwa, Surāshṭra in Kāṭhiāwār and Sindhu-Sauvīra in the lower valley of the Indus. In an early Buddhist text we have a list of sixteen great nations that occupied the territory from the Kābul valley to the banks of the Godāvarī shortly before the rise of Buddhism. The names of these states are Aṅga (East Bihār), Magadha (South Bihār), Kāsi (Benares), Kosala (Oudh), Vṛiji (North Bihār), Malla (Gorakhpur district), Chedi (between the Jumnā and the Narmadā), Vatsa (Allahābād region), Kuru (Thānesar, Delhi and Meerut districts), Pañchāla (Bareilly, Budāūn and Farrukhābād districts), Matsya (Jaipur), Śūrasena (Mathurā), Aśmaka (on the Godāvarī), Avanti (in Mālwa), Gandhāra (Peshāwār and Rāwalpiṇḍi districts), and Kamboja (Southwest Kāshmīr and parts of Kāfiristān). The palmy days of the Kurus and the Pañchālas were now over, and the centre of political gravity had shifted to the east.

The Vrijian State

Among the eastern nations mentioned in the above list, the name of the *Videhas* is conspicuous by its absence, and in its place we find mention of Vṛiji (Vajji). The Vṛijian State was formed by the union of several clans including the *Lichchhavis* and the *Jñātṛikas*. Its capital was at Vaiśālī, modern Besarh or Basarh and Bakhira in the district of Muzaffarpur. The Vṛiji people have been represented by a modern writer as of Mongolian origin because they followed certain customs that are classed as Tibetan, such as exposure of the dead, and also because they are regarded by the Brāhmaṇa law-givers as *Vrātyas* or degraded Kshatriyas. But similar customs are found also among the Irānians; and the *Vrātyas*, judging from Vedic evidence, were clearly an Aryan people, though outside the pale of orthodox Brāhmaṇism. It is significant that in Buddhist literature the fine appearance of the *Lichchhavis* is compared to that of the *Tāvatiṁsa* gods.

The *Vrijis* had no monarch, but a popular assembly and elders

who carried on the business of the State. This type of polity was known as a *Gaṇa* or republic. The *Mallas* had a similar constitution and there were besides these a number of smaller republics, e.g., the *Śākyas* of Kapilavastu, the *Bhargas* of Sumsumāra Hill, the *Mauryas* of Pipphalivana, etc.

Four Great Kingdoms

The republics had soon to contend with formidable enemies in the persons of the ambitious potentates of the neighbouring monarchies. Four of the kingdoms had grown more powerful than the rest and were following a policy of expansion and aggrandisement at the expense of their neighbours. These were Avanti, Vatsa, Kosala and Magadha.

The kingdom of Avanti had its capital at Ujjain in modern Mālwa. It was ruled by King Chanda Pradyota Mahāsena, who brought the states in the vicinity of his realm under his control. In the Vatsa territory, i.e., the district round Kauśāmbī or Kosam near Allahābād, reigned Udayana, a scion of the Bharata race, who carried off the beloved daughter of Pradyota and took a wife also from the royal house of Magadha. The supremacy of Udayana extended over the adjoining territory of the Bhargas.

Kosala was ruled by King Mahākosala and his son Prasenajit. It roughly corresponded to modern Oudh. In the heroic age it had its capital at Ayodhyā, on the bank of the river Sarayū, and was ruled by a dynasty that claimed descent from the illustrious Ikshvāku, famed in Vedic and epic tradition. Kosala kings like Para, son of Aṭṇāra, won renown as conquerors and sacrificers. Epic tradition represents Kosalan princes as having penetrated through the wilds of Daṇḍakāraṇya, in the Deccan, to the banks of the Pampā or the Tuṅgabhadrā and even to the distant island of Ceylon. A branch of the ruling family established itself in Śrāvastī, which has been identified with the great ruined city on the south bank of the Rāptī represented by Saheṭh-Maheṭh. Members of this line extended the boundaries of Kosala in several directions and absorbed the territory of the Sākyas in the Nepalese Tarai and that of the Kāsis in the present district of Benares. But the ambitious designs of Kosala were soon frustrated by another power that arose in the fastnesses of South Bihār.

Magadha, embracing the districts of Patna and Gayā in the southern part of Bihār, could boast of powerful chieftains even in the days of the Vedic *Ṛishis* and the epic poets. As the probable home of the non-Aryan *Kīkaṭas*, who were noted for their wealth

of kine, it was a coveted prize of the Aryan invader, who, however, could not Brāhmaṇise it thoroughly even in the period of the *Kalpa Sūtras*. It came to possess a mixed population. Brāhmaṇas and Kshatriyas coming to the land were spoken of in a derisive tone as *Brahma-bandhu* and *Kshatra-bandhu*, that is, so-called Brāhmaṇas and Kshatriyas. It had special relations with Aryans outside the pale to whom the name *Vrātya* was given in the Vedic canon.

In the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. the throne of Magadha was occupied by a line of kings styled Śaiśunāgas in the Purāṇas, an appellation derived from Śiśunāga, the first king of the line in the Purāṇic list. Buddhist writers, however, place Śiśunāga much lower in the list of kings, and split up the line into two distinct groups. To the earlier of the two groups they give the name Haryaṅka. The second and later group, consisting of Śiśunāga, his son and grandsons, alone deserve, according to their evidence, the name Śaiśunāga.

Bimbisāra

The most remarkable king of the Haryaṅka line was Śreṇika or Bimbisāra, who was anointed king by his father while yet a boy of fifteen. The event took place, according to Ceylonese tradition, sixty years before the *Parinirvāṇa*, or the death of the Buddha. The *Parinirvāṇa* happened in 544 B.C. according to a Ceylonese reckoning and in 486 B.C. according to a Cantonese tradition of A.D. 489. The date 544 B.C. can, however, hardly be reconciled with a statement in the Ceylonese Chronicles that Aśoka Maurya, who is known to have flourished in the third century B.C., was consecrated two hundred and eighteen years after the Buddha had passed into Nirvāṇa. This fact and certain Chinese and Chola synchronisms led Geiger and a few other scholars to think that the era of 544 B.C. is a comparatively modern fabrication and that the true date of the death of the Buddha is 483 B.C.—a result closely approaching that to which the Cantonese tradition leads us.

The Chinese account of embassies which King Meghavarṇa sent to Samudra Gupta and King Kia-che (Kassapa) sent to China in A.D. 527 also speaks in favour of the date 486 B.C. or 483 B.C. for the *Parinirvāṇa*. Geiger's date, however, is not explicitly recognised by tradition. The Cantonese date, therefore, may be accepted as a working hypothesis for the Aśokan and pre-Aśokan periods. The date of Bimbisāra's accession, according to this reckoning, would fall about 545 B.C.

From the first, Bimbisāra pursued a policy of expansion. He

possessed certain advantages denied to many of his contemporaries. He was the ruler of a compact kingdom protected on all sides by mountains and rivers. His capital, Girivraja, was enclosed by five hills. It was also girded with stone walls which are among the oldest extant stone structures in India. The soil of the country was rich, yielding luxuriant crops. It was made richer by the gold-bearing stream, the Hiraṇyavāha or the Śoṇa, which unites with the Ganges near Patna. The people profited by the trade that passed along the Ganges, or followed the land-route through the city of Gayā. In his war-elephants the eastern monarch had a fighting machine which could be used with terrible effect against his western neighbours.

The most notable achievement of Bimbisāra was the annexation of the neighbouring kingdom of Aṅga or East Bihār, which had its capital at Champā near Bhāgalpur. He also entered into matrimonial alliances with the ruling families of Kosala and Vaiśālī. His Kosalan wife brought a Kāsi village yielding a large revenue. The Vaiśālī marriage ultimately paved the way for the expansion of Magadha northward to the borders of Nepāl. Bimbisāra organised an efficient system of administration. He is also credited by a Chinese pilgrim with having built a new city at the foot of the hills lying to the north of Girivraja, which he named Rājagṛiha, or the king's house, the modern Rājgir in the Patna district. Under him Magadha became a flourishing kingdom which attracted the most enlightened men of the age. Both Vardhamāna Mahāvīra, the last apostle of the Jainas, and Gautama Buddha, the great Master of the Buddhists, preached their doctrines during the reign of Bimbisāra. Tradition affirms that in his old age the king was murdered by his son Ajātaśatru.

Ajātaśatru

Ajātaśatru, also known as Kūnika, soon found that his throne was not a bed of roses. Prasenajit of Kosala, brother of the queen-dowager, who had died of grief, resolved to avenge himself on the parricide. The republican tribes on the northern and north-western borders of Magadha were restive and entered into a league with the enemies of Ajātaśatru in Kāsi-Kosala. The Magadhan king had thus to face the hostility not only of the ruler of Srāvastī but also of the Vṛijis of Vaiśālī and the Mallas of Kuśīnagara (Kasia in Gorakhpur) and Pāvā (probably Padraona on the Gaṇḍak river). To repel the Vṛijis, Magadhan statesmen fortified the village of Pāṭaligrāma which stood near the confluence of the Ganges

and the Śoṇa. Thus was founded the famous fortress which, within a generation, developed into the stately city of Pāṭaliputra, the metropolis of India for well-nigh four centuries.

Thanks to his own tenacity and the Machiavellian policy of his ministers, Ajātaśatru succeeded in defeating all his adversaries. The Vṛiji territory was annexed to the kingdom of Magadha. Kosala was humbled but not crushed, and, at a slightly later period, we hear of a Kosalan king, a son of Prasenajit, powerful enough to perpetrate a massacre of the Śākyas. Prasenajit himself had to renounce his claim to the Kāsi village which had hitherto formed a bone of contention, and give his Magadhan antagonist his daughter in marriage. In religious tradition Ajātaśatru is remembered as a patron of Devadatta, the schismatic cousin of the Buddha, and also as a friend of both the Jainas and the Buddhists. Both Mahāvīra and the Buddha are said to have died early in his reign. After the death of the latter, a Buddhist Council was held at Rājagṛiha which took disciplinary measures against certain prominent members of the Church and compiled the holy scriptures.

Successors of Ajātaśatru

According to the Purāṇas, the immediate successor of Ajātaśatru was Darśaka, after whom came his son Udāyi. The name of Darśaka occurs also in a play named *Svapna-Vāsavadatta*, attributed to Bhāsa, which represents him as a brother-in-law and contemporary of Udayana, king of Kauśāmbī. But Buddhist and Jain writers agree in asserting that Udāyi was the son of Ajātaśatru and also his successor. A Nāga-dāsaka is placed by the former at the end of the list of kings of Bimbisāra's line, and this ruler is identified by some with the Darśaka of the Purāṇas. In view of the antiquity of the Buddhist tradition, it is difficult to accept the Purāṇic statement about Udāyi's relationship with Darśaka and Ajātaśatru as correct.

Udāyi had probably to fight with the king of Avanti, but the most notable event of his reign was the foundation of the city of Kusumapura or Pāṭaliputra nestling under the shelter of the fortress erected by the ministers of Ajātaśatru.

The history of Magadha after Udāyi is obscure. The Purānic Chronicles place immediately after him two kings named Nandivardhana and Mahānandin, the last of whom is said to have had a son, by a Śūdra woman, named Mahāpadma or Mahāpadmapati Nanda, with whom began a line of Śūdra or semi-Śūdra kings. Buddhist writers, on the other hand, insert thirteen additional

names between Udāyi and Nandivardhana. They omit Mahānandin and mention in his place a prince named Panchamaka. According to the Buddhist account, Udāyi was followed by Anuruddha, Muṇḍa, and Nāgadāsaka, all parricides, of whom the last was banished by the indignant citizens, who met together and anointed as their king a worthy minister known by the name of Śiśunāga (Susunāga). Śiśunāga was succeeded by his son Kālāsoka, after whom came his sons, ten in number, of whom the ninth was Nandivardhana and the tenth Pañchamaka. One Buddhist work, the *Asokāvadāna*, mentions Kākavarnin, instead of Kālāsoka, among the successors of Muṇḍa.

The most important divergence between the Buddhist and Purāṇic accounts is in regard to the place assigned to Śiśunāga and Kākavarṇin (Kākavarṇa) in the dynastic lists. While Buddhist writers place them long after Bimbisāra, Ajātasatru and even Udāyi, and represent them as belonging to a different family, the Purāṇas make them head the whole list and actually refer to them as ancestors of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru. There is, however, one detail in the Purāṇic account which throws doubt on the credibility of the tradition it transmits, and tends to confirm the Buddhist evidence. After mentioning the successors of Pradyota, king of Avanti, whom we know to be a contemporary of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru, the Purāṇas say: "Śiśunāga will destroy all their prestige and will be king." This clear assertion undoubtedly supports the view that Śiśunāga came long after Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru, and carried on their forward policy by the absorption of the powerful kingdom of Avanti (Mālwa).

Śiśunāga's successor, Kālāsoka or Kākavarṇin, seems to have been a ruler of some consequence. He transferred his royal residence permanently from Girivraja to Pāṭaliputra, though Vaiśālī was occasionally graced by the presence of the sovereign. It was in this last city that the second great Council of the Buddhists is said to have been held in the tenth year of the king's reign when a century had gone by since the *Parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha. The Assembly settled some disputed points of discipline and condemned the action of certain Vṛijian monks who tried to introduce a relaxation of the rules. The end of Kākavarṇa was tragic. Tradition affirms that he had a dagger thrust into his throat in the vicinity of a city which may have been Pāṭaliputra, Vaiśālī or some other important city in the empire. His sons were probably young and inexperienced and soon made room for a man of sterner stuff.

The Nandas

The new king belonged to a family called Nanda by all our authorities. His personal name or epithet was Mahāpadma or Mahāpadmapati, "sovereign of an infinite host", or "of immense wealth", according to the Purāṇas, and Ugrasena, "possessed of a terrible army", according to Buddhist writers. After him his eight sons rùled in succession, and then the crown went to Chandragupta Maurya, the founder of a new and more illustrious dynasty. The total duration of the Nanda line was 155 years according to the Jain texts, a century according to the Purāṇas, and only 22 years according to the Buddhist chronicles of Ceylon. The Jain figure is too high for a couple of generations. The Purāṇas agree in assigning a period of 12 years to the sons of Mahāpadma. But they differ in regard to the duration of the reign of Mahāpadma himself, which some put at 88 years and others at 28 years. The smaller figure 28 when added to 12 does not make up the total 100. The higher figure 88 for one reign is incredible and its rejection involves a reduction of the total period of 100 years assigned by Purāṇic tradition to the Nandas. In view of this, the Ceylonese account cannot be lightly dismissed.

Regarding the parentage of the first Nanda, we have two distinct traditions. The Purāṇas represent him as son of Mahānandin, the last king of the Śaiśunāga dynasty, by a Śūdra woman. Jaina writers, on the other hand, represent him as the son of a courtesan by a barber. The Jaina tradition about the barber origin of the first Nanda is strikingly supported by the testimony of Quintus Curtius. Referring to the *father* of the *predecessor* of Chandragupta Maurya who must be identified with the first Nanda, Curtius says that he was a barber who gained the affections of the queen, murdered his sovereign, and then, under the pretence of acting as guardian of the royal children, usurped the supreme authority. He next put the young princes to death. The murdered sovereign seems to have been Kākavarṇin, whose sons were evidently the young princes who were done to death by the ambitious barber.

The new king, though of humble origin, was a vigorous ruler. Purāṇic tradition affirms that he exterminated all Kshatriyas and became sole monarch, bringing all under his undisputed sway. The ascription of a wide dominion to the Nanda king is supported by Greek evidence which refers to the most powerful peoples who dwelt beyond the Beas in the time of Alexander as being under one sovereign who had his capital at Pāṭaliputra. A Kaliṅga inscription of early date refers to Nanda's connection with an

aqueduct in that country. This may be taken to imply that King Nanda held sway also in Kaliṅga, that is, Southern Orissa and the contiguous part of the Northern Circars.

The first Nanda was succeeded by his eight sons, of whom the last was named Dhana-Nanda, the Agrammes or Xandrames of classical writers. This monarch owned a vast treasure and commanded a huge army of 20,000 cavalry, 200,000 infantry, 2,000 chariots and no less than 3,000 elephants. Some writers raise the number of horsemen, chariots and elephants to 80,000, 8,000, and 6,000 respectively. To amass the treasure and maintain the huge force, the king had to resort to heavy taxation. His conduct towards the people bespoke his low origin. It is therefore no wonder that he was "detested and held cheap by his subjects". The disaffected element found a leader in Chandragupta who overthrew the Nanda dynasty, and laid the foundation of the illustrious family of the Mauryas. If tradition is to be believed, a Taxilian Brāhmaṇa named Kauṭilya or Chāṇakya played a leading part in the dynastic revolution. The conqueror of the Nandas had also another problem—the presence of foreign invaders in the north-western provinces of his country.

Persian and Macedonian Invasions

Gandhāra, the territory round Peshāwār and Rāwalpiṇḍi, was, in the time of Bimbisāra, under a king named Pukkusāti, who sent an embassy and a letter to the king of Magadha. What the object of the mission was we do not know, but about the middle of the sixth century B.C. we find the hordes of Cyrus (*c.* 558–530 B.C.), the founder of the Achaemenian empire of Persia, knocking at the gates of India and destroying the famous city of Kāpiśa near the junction of the Ghorband and Panjshir rivers north-east of Kābul. The district west of the river Indus became tributary to the Persians, and the name of Gandhāra began to appear prominently among the subject nations in the early inscriptions of Darius (522–486 B.C.), the most illustrious among the successors of Cyrus. Darius followed up the earlier successes of his house by sending a naval expedition to the Indus under the command of Skylax. This expedition paved the way for the annexation of the Indus valley as far as the deserts of Rājputāna. It constituted the twentieth and the most populous satrapy of the Persian empire. It paid a tribute proportionately larger than all the rest—360 Euboic talents of gold dust, equivalent to more than a million sterling.

Xerxes, the son of Darius I, and his successors seem to have maintained some control over the Indian provinces, which furnished contingents to their army. Reference is made in certain inscriptions of Xerxes to the suppression of rebellion in lands "where, before, the Daivas were worshipped; then, by Ahuramazda's will, of such temples of the Daivas I (the king) sapped the foundations". The Daiva-worshipping lands may have included the Indian satrapies. But the hold of the later Achaemenians on their eastern possessions gradually became weak, and towards the middle of the fourth century B.C. the Indian borderland was parcelled out among various small States, the rulers of which were practically independent.

The hill country north of the Kābul river, drained by the Kunar and the Swāt, was occupied mainly by the Aśvakas, a people whose name is derived from the Sanskrit *Aśva*, Irānian *Aspa* (horse). Somewhere in this mountain region stood also the city of Nysa, alleged to have been founded by Greek colonists. The old territory of Gandhāra was divided into two parts by the Indus. To the west of the river lay the kingdom of Pushkalāvatī in the modern district of Peshāwār and to its east was the realm of Takshaśilā (Taxila) in the present district of Rāwalpindi. Taxila was a prosperous kingdom governed by good laws. Its capital was a noble city which occupied the site of the present Bhir Mound near Saraikala, twenty miles north-west of Rāwalpiṇḍi. It lay on the high road from Central Asia to the interior of India, and the fame of its market-place spread to the distant corners of the civilised world. Great as an emporium of commerce, the city was greater still as a centre of learning. Crowds of eager scholars flocked to it for instruction in the three Vedas and the eighteen branches of knowledge. Tradition affirms that the Great Epic, the *Mahābhārata* was first recited in this city.

The mountain territory just above the Taxila country was occupied by the kingdoms of Uraśā (Hazāra district) and Abhisāra (Punch and Naoshera). To the south-east of Taxila lay the twin kingdoms of the Pūrus or Pauravas, a people already famous in the Vedic hymns. The territory of the prince mentioned by Greek historians as the elder Poros, was situated between the Jhelum and the Chenāb, while the principality of his nephew, the younger Poros, stretched from the Chenāb to the Rāvi. On the confines of the country of the Pauravas lay the territories of the Glaukanikoi and Kathaioi and the principality of Saubhūti. The southern part of the Jhang district with the contiguous portion of the lower valley of the Rāvī was occupied by the *Sibis* and the *Mālavas*, with whom were associated the *Kshudrakas*, while lower down the

Chenāb lived the *Ambashṭhas*. These tribes were autonomous and some of them are expressly mentioned as having a democratic government. Upper Sind was divided among a number of potentates of whom the most important was Mousikanos, whose capital probably lay at or near Alor. In the Indus delta stood the city of Pattala which, like Sparta, was governed by two kings and a Senate of Elders.

In 336 B.C. the throne of Macedon, a powerful military State in the land of the Yavanas in south-east Europe, was occupied by Alexander, a prince of remarkable energy and ability. In 333 and 331 B.C. Alexander inflicted two severe defeats on the great king of Persia, the last of the line of Darius and Xerxes, and occupied his realm. In 330 B.C. the Persian king died, leaving his conqueror the undisputed master of the Achaemenian empire. Three years later, in 327 B.C., Alexander crossed the Hindukush and resolved to recover the Indian satrapies that had once acknowledged the sway of his Persian predecessors. To secure his communications, he garrisoned a number of strongholds near modern Kābul and passed the winter of 327–326 B.C. in warfare with the fierce hill tribes of the Kunar and Swāt valleys. He stormed the fortresses of Massaga and Aornos and received the submission of the city of Nysa. His generals took the city of Pushkalāvatī. Massaga probably lay to the north of the Malakand Pass. Aornos has recently been identified with the height of Unā between the Swāt and the Indus, while Nysa has been located on the lower spurs of the three-peaked Koh-i-Mor between the Kunar and Swāt valleys. Pushkalāvatī is represented by the modern Charsadda near the junction of the Swāt and Kābul rivers, about seventeen miles north-east of Peshāwār.

The conqueror next forced his way through dense jungles to Ohind and crossed the Indus by a bridge of boats (326 B.C.). In his operations, he received valuable help from Āmbhi, king of Taxila, who now received the invader in his own capital with obsequious pomp. After a brief respite, Alexander resumed his march and pushed on to the Hydaspes (Vitastā, modern Jhelum). According to one theory, he followed the line of the modern Grand Trunk Road to the town of Jhelum. According to another view, he descended through the pass of Nandan to the right bank of the Hydaspes close to the village of Haranpur. On his arrival, he found a huge army drawn up on the other bank of the river to oppose his further progress. The formidable host was led by the elder Paurava king, a man of gigantic and powerful build, who was mortified at the pusillanimous conduct of his Taxilian neighbour,

and resolved to defend his hearth and home against the audacious invader from the west. Alexander found it impossible to cross the stream, which was then in full flood, in the face of a mighty array of warriors and elephants. He diverted the attention of his enemy by demonstrations in different directions and then stole a passage at a sharp bend of the river about seventeen miles above his camp, under cover of a thickly wooded promontory and an island in mid-stream covered with jungle. The place of crossing is located by some above the town of Jhelum and by others at Jalalpur. A small force that had hurried to dispute the passage of the invaders was easily routed, and Alexander advanced quickly to give battle to the Indian king. The Paurava, too, marched forth to meet his adversary and drew up his army in battle array. He had with him 30,000 foot, 4,000 horses, 300 chariots, and 200 elephants. He arranged his elephants in front of the infantry and placed the cavalry on the wings with chariots in front of them. The vast force looked like a city with elephants as bastions and men-at-arms as the circumvallating wall. The field of battle cannot be definitely located. Scholars who place Alexander's camp at Jhelum think that the hostile forces met in the Karri plain.

The Indian king made the mistake of allowing the Macedonians to take the offensive with their superior cavalry. The latter began by an attack on the Indian left wing. The Indian charioteer and horseman could not withstand the onslaught of the mounted archers in the Macedonian ranks, and the Indian infantry were prevented by the slippery slush under foot from making an effective use of their formidable bows. The elephants for a time spread havoc in the enemy's ranks, but many of the monsters were maddened by wounds and rushed on friends and foes alike. The Paurava force suffered most and was soon scattered by the veterans of Alexander. The Indian king, however, did not flee, but went on fighting on a mighty elephant until he received a severe wound. He was then brought to the presence of the conqueror, who asked him how he would like to be treated. "Act like a king," answered the valiant Paurava. The Macedonian treated his gallant adversary generously and gave him back his kingdom. It was no part of Alexander's policy to alienate the sympathy of powerful local princes if it could be helped, and he understood the value of brave and chivalrous allies in a newly-acquired territory, far away from the seat of empire, who could be trusted to uphold the authority of the supreme ruler and serve as a check on one another.

The invader next overran the petty principalities and tribal

territories in the vicinity of the realm of the great Paurava. He crossed the Akesines (Chenāb) and the Hydraotes (Rāvī), stormed Sāngala, the stronghold of the Kathaioi, probably situated in the Gurudaspur district, and moved on to the Hyphasis (Beas). He wished to press forward to the Ganges valley, but his war-worn troops would not allow him to go farther. The king erected twelve towering altars to mark the utmost limit of his march, and then with a heavy heart retraced his steps to the Jhelum. He sent part of his troops down the river in a flotilla of boats under the command of Nearchos. The rest fought their way through the territory of free and warlike tribes inhabiting the lower valley of the Rāvī and the Chenāb. Thousands of people, including women and children, perished in the course of the struggle, and the inhabitants of one city, preferring death to dishonour, threw themselves into the flame in the manner of the Rājputs who practised *Jauhar* in later times.

The conqueror himself received a dangerous wound while storming one of the citadels of the powerful tribe of the *Mālavas*. The subdued nations made presents of chariots, bucklers, gems, draperies, lions, tigers, etc. Alexander next reduced the principalities of Sind and sailed to the open sea (325 B.C.). A portion of the Macedonian host had already been sent home through Afghānistān. Another division, led by the king himself, trudged through the deserts of Baluchistān and, after terrible sufferings, reached Babylon. The rest of the troops returned by sea to the north of the Tigris under the command of Nearchos. Alexander did not long survive his return to Babylon, where he died in 323 B.C.

Administrative arrangements made by Alexander

The Macedonian king had no desire to renounce his new conquests. He wished to incorporate them permanently into his extensive empire. He formed the districts to the west of the Hydaspes into regular satrapies under Persian or Macedonian governors who were assisted, in some cases, by Indian chiefs like Śaśigupta of Aornos and Āmbhi of Taxila. Beyond the river he created a system of protected States under vassal kings, among whom the great Paurava and the king of Abhisāra were the most eminent. Macedonian garrisons were stationed in Pushkalāvatī, Taxila, and other important strategic centres. New cities were built, mostly on the great rivers, to establish the authority of the conqueror firmly in the acquired territories and stimulate trade and navigation in the Land of the Five Rivers.

Effect of the Persian and Macedonian Invasions

The Macedonian prefectures and garrisons were soon swept away by Chandragupta Maurya, and within a few years all vestige of foreign domination disappeared from the Punjab and Sind. But the invasions of Darius and Alexander had not been in vain. The Persian conquest had unveiled India probably for the first time to the Western world and established contact between this country and the peoples of the Levant. Indian spearmen and archers fought under the Persian banner on European soil in the fifth century B.C. and quickened the interest of the peoples of Hellas in this land of strange folks and surpassing wealth. Persian and Greek officials found employment in the Indus provinces and made their presence felt in various ways. The introduction of new scripts—Aramaic, *Kharoshṭhī* and the alphabet styled *Yavanānī* by Pāṇini, is probably to be traced to this source. Whether some important features of the architecture of the Maurya period and certain phrases used in the Aśokan edicts are also to be attributed to their enterprise, is a highly debatable question. The hold of the great king on the Indian frontier slackened considerably in the fourth century B.C. The arduous campaigns of Alexander restored the fallen fabric of imperialism and laid the foundation of a closer contact between India and the Hellenic world. The Macedonian empire in the Indus valley no doubt perished within a short time. But the Macedonian had welded the political atoms into one unit and thus paved the way for the more permanent union under the Mauryas. The voyages and expeditions planned by Alexander widened the geographical horizon of his contemporaries, and opened up new lines of communication and new routes for trade and maritime enterprise. The colonies that the conqueror planted in the Indian borderland do not appear to have been altogether wiped out by the Mauryas. Yavana officials continued to serve the great king of Magadha as they had served the great king of Ecbatana and Persepolis, and Yavana adventurers carved out independent kingdoms in the north-west when the sun of Magadha set. If Greeks in later ages learnt lessons in philosophy and religion from Indian Buddhists and Bhāgavatas, the Indians on their part imitated the Greek coinage, honoured Greek astronomers and appreciated Hellenistic art. This was due ultimately to the measures that Alexander had adopted "to set little bits of Hellas down" in the wilds of Western and Central Asia and on the banks of the Indus and the Akesines.

CHAPTER VI

CIVILISATION IN THE EARLY DAYS OF MAGADHAN ASCENDANCY

Sources

For the history of the Indian civilisation during the early period of Magadhan hegemony we have to turn to various sources. No single set of documents gives a picture of the whole of India. For an authentic account of the Indus valley and the north-western borderland, we have to depend mainly on Greek evidence. For the *Madhya-deśa* or the upper Ganges valley, and particularly its western part, the land of the Kurus and the Pañchālas which was the cradle and centre of Brāhmaṇism, we have to look to the Brāhmaṇical *Sūtras* and the early epic. The epic, no doubt, looks back to the heroic age which is coeval with the later Vedic period, but the extant poems have a wider geographical outlook than the later Vedic texts.

Administration

Neither in the east nor in the west was monarchy the only form of government in the beginning of our period or towards its close. There were, no doubt, powerful *rājās* in South Bihār and Oudh, as well as in Mālwa and the Punjab, who were fighting to extend their authority at the expense of their neighbours and build up true imperial States. But they had to reckon with free and war-like tribes, governed by their own elders and owning the authority of no monarch. Kingship, again, was not everywhere of the same type. Some of the kingdoms in eastern India were true *Sāmrājyas*, governed by rulers who could justly call themselves *Ekarāṭ* or sole monarch. In the Indus delta, on the other hand, we have kings who commanded in war but left the work of government to a Senate of Elders. The number of kings was two, as in Sparta, an early instance of *dvairājya* or diarchy, so famous in Indian history and tradition. While Śūdras acquired supreme power in the lower Ganges valley, the state of things in the lower valley of the Indus was different, and great political power was exercised

by the Brāhmaṇas. The *rājā* of the *Mzdhya-deśa*, judging by the testimony of the epic, was no autocrat. He carried on the affairs of his realm with the assistance of the *Sabhā*, usually consisting of princes of the blood and military chiefs. The circle of advisers was sometimes enlarged by the admission of priests and officials or representatives of lower orders like the *Sūtas*. Among certain tribes, all clansmen had a right to attend the *Sabhā*, which was thus a popular assembly and not a council of magnates. Even in kingdoms where the popular assembly is not much in evidence, the monarch had to defer to the wishes of Brāhmaṇas, elders of corporations and the commonalty. He had to do what was pleasing to the people. For the efficient discharge of his duties he had to learn the *Vedas* and the *Śāstras*. Tyrannical princes were not infrequently expelled from the throne. Even in Magadha, the citadel of imperialism, the king consulted the village headmen. A dynasty was driven out by the citizens because of its delinquencies.

Monarchies were often hereditary and the reigning prince at times nominated his successor. But cases of election are referred to by all our authorities. Choice was sometimes limited to members of the royal family, but on occasions selections were made from outside. A Greek writer tells us that in a certain district of the Punjab the handsomest man was chosen as king. Kingship was no longer a monopoly of the Kshatriya caste, and one of the most powerful dynasties of the age was of Śūdra extraction.

With the growth of kingdoms and the incorporation of new territory, the office of the viceroy and provincial governor became more and more important. Among other State functionaries, the *Purohita* was of special importance in Kāsi-Kosala, as we learn from the *Rāmāyaṇa* and several *Jātakas*. In the Kuru-Pañchāla and Matsya countries, on the other hand, the *Purohita* was over-shadowed by the *Senāpati*, who was often a prince of the blood or a person of royal rank.

The most important feature of the administrative development of the period under review was the rise of a class of high officials styled *mahāmātras*, who are unknown to the Vedic texts and gradually tend to disappear after the Maurya and Sātavāhana periods. They were charged with duties of a varied character. Some looked after general affairs (*sarvārthaka*). Others administered justice (*vyāvahārika*). A third body had charge of the army (*senā-nāyaka*). Others were entrusted with the work of cadastral survey (*rajjugrāhaka*) or measurement of the king's share of the produce (*dronamāpaka*).

In the administration of justice, the king continued to play

an important part. It was his duty to give decisions in accordance with the special laws of the districts, castes, and families. But much of the judicial work was now entrusted to the *Vyāvahārikas* or judges.

Scarcely less important than the administration of justice was the protection of the people from armed foes. To do this duty the rulers had to maintain big armies. Important changes were effected in military organisation by the introduction of war-elephants as a regular feature of the fighting forces, and the creation of the body of *mahāmātras* to take charge of the department of war. Armies of the period usually consisted of four elements: infantry, cavalry, chariots and elephants. To these the later epic adds the navy, labourers, spies and local guides. Greek writers refer to expert sailors in the Indus delta whom the Macedonians employed to steer their vessels down to the ocean when their own attempts at navigation failed. It is not improbable that rulers of the deltaic regions maintained small fleets even before the organisation of a big naval department by the founder of the Maurya dynasty.

About the equipment of Indian troops in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. we have fortunately a few details recorded by Greek observers. The Indian infantry, clad in cotton garments, usually carried long bows and iron-tipped arrows made of cane. Some were armed with spears. They also carried a two-handed sword and a buckler of undressed ox-hide. The cavalry had usually the same equipment as the infantry. The chariots were drawn by horses or wild asses and carried six men apiece, of whom two were bowmen, two were shield-bearers, and two were charioteers. Epic poets refer to the division of the army into *akshauhinīs*, *vāhinīs*, etc., mention different kinds of battle-array (*vyūha*), and allude to various projectiles including the *śataghnī* or hundred-killer. Jaina writers refer to the use made by Ajātaśatru of the *mahāsilākaṇṭaga* and *ra(t)hamusala*. The first seems to have been some engine of war of the nature of a catapult which threw big stones. The second was a chariot to which a mace was attached and which, running about, effected great execution.

Greek writers bear testimony to the fact that in the art of war Indians were far superior to the other peoples of Asia. Their failure to offer a successful resistance to foreign invaders was often due to an inferiority in cavalry. Indian commanders in ancient times pinned their faith more upon elephants than upon horses.

The maintenance of a splendid court, a big army and a large body of civil officials required money. Weak rulers had sometimes to appease their conquerors by the payment of heavy tribute.

Some of the kings loved to hoard treasure to the amount of several millions. The collection of revenue was, therefore, all-important to the State, and sometimes strange expedients were resorted to by rulers to fill their treasuries. The oldest source of revenue was the *bali*, a contribution mentioned as early as the Vedic hymns. *Bhāga*, the king's share of reaped corn, became, in course of time, the most important source of State revenue, and *shaḍbhāgin*, "a sharer of the sixth part", a standing epithet of the king. The *bhāga* was measured out either by the village authorities or by royal officials at the barn-doors, or by survey of the crops. Among the most important revenue officials was the *Grāma-bhojaka* or village head-man. The office was sometimes held by royal ministers. *Bali* gradually acquired the sense of an oppressive impost, and the collectors of *bali* were apparently classed with man-eating demons. Among other royal dues, mention may be made of "milk-money", payable by the people when an heir was born to the king, and taxes and octroi duties paid by merchants. The ruler also imposed at times forced labour and claimed the right to dispose of forest land and unowned property.

About the kingless States or republics our information is mainly derived from Buddhist and Greek sources, though some details are given by the Sanskrit epics and works on polity as well as the sacred literature of the Jainas. Coins and inscriptions are not of much help for our period. The word for a republic was *Saṁgha* or *Gaṇa*, but the terms were also applied to religious fraternities and economic corporations. Like monarchies, the republics, too, were not all of the same type. Some were tribal oligarchies, others are expressly mentioned as having a democratic constitution. Some of these States embraced several clans, others were limited to single *Kulas* or even cities. Some were sovereign States owning no allegiance to any external authority. Others did homage to some neighbouring potentate, though enjoying a considerable degree of local autonomy. There were, however, certain features common to all. Each had its *parishad* or assembly which met in the *saṁsthāgāra* or mote-hall where young and old alike were present. According to a high authority, the method of procedure generally adopted in the tribal meetings was not by voting on a motion. The point at issue was either carried unanimously or referred for arbitration to a committee of referees. Besides the central assembly at the capital, there were local *parishads* in all the more important places in the State. The citizens honoured and esteemed the *Mahallakas* or elders and held it a point of duty to hearken to their words. Executive government was in the hands

of a single chief or a number of chiefs styled *Rājan, Gaṇa rājan* or *Saṁghamukhya*, corresponding to the Roman consul or Greek archon. The *Rājās* or *Saṁghamukhyas* were either identical with the *Mahallakas* or selected from them. The title *Rājan* was sometimes loosely applied to all the chief men of the State, for we hear of 7,707 *Rājās* among the *Lichchhavis*, though one document puts the figure at 500 and a Jaina text seems to limit the title to only nine. A Buddhist commentary seems to suggest that the *Rājās* ruled by turns. The number of elderly citizens eligible for the chief executive office probably fluctuated from time to time.

Besides the *Rājan* there were other functionaries styled *Uparājan* (vice-consul), *Senāpati* (general), *Bhāṇḍāgārika* (treasurer), etc.

Social Life

With the Aryan expansion over practically the whole of India, came a wide diversity of social conditions. Customs not approved in the Gangetic Doāb were admitted as good usage in the north beyond the river Sarasvatī or the south beyond the Narmadā. Women, for example, enjoyed in southern India certain privileges denied to their mid-Indian sisters. The wife in the south was allowed to eat in the company of her husband, and restrictions on the marriage of cognates were not so strict in the south as in the north. Widow marriage and Levirate had not fallen into disuse even in the Ganges valley, and burning of widows was not sanctioned by the orthodox lawgivers. But the practice of *Satī* could not have been unknown in the north-west. In the epic we hear of the self-immolation of a princess born in the Madra country in the Punjab, and Greek writers refer to the widow of an Indian commander who "departed to the pyre crowned with fillets by her women and decked out splendidly as for a wedding". A few polyandrous marriages are alluded to in the epic, but these were not sanctioned by general usage and must have been of very rare occurrence.

The picture of the woman in the Greek accounts, Buddhist discourses or epic tales does not always agree with that portrayed in the formal codes of law. The women of the *Dharma-Sūtras* were helpless beings who were always dependent on their male relations and were classed with properties of minors or sealed deposits. The women known to Alexander's contemporaries took the arms of their fallen relatives and fought side by side with the men against the enemy of their country. The epic matron exhorted her indolent son to "flare up like a torch, though it be

but for a moment, but smother not like a fire of chaff just to prolong life". Education was not denied to women, some of whom are described as being widely known for their knowledge, learning, and dialectic skill. Buddhist texts refer to princesses who composed poems that are preserved in the *Therī-gāthā* or the Psalms of the Sisters. In several epic stories we find references to *svayamvara* or choice of a husband by the bride herself, and in a famous episode of the *Mahābhārata* a king asked his daughter to choose a husband and said that he would give her the man of her choice. Seclusion of women was practised in certain families, but many of the epic tales bear witness to a freer life where women laid aside their veils and came out of the seclusion of their houses. This was specially the case on the occasion of a great national festival or sorrow. "Women should not be slain," says one great epic poet. "A wife is half the man," says another, and adds that

> "Whene'er we suffer pain and grief
> Like mothers kind they bring relief."

The common people mostly lived in villages in humble dwellings made of thatch which were sometimes mud-plastered for fear of fire. Kings resided in fortified towns (*pur*) or cities (*nagara*) provided with lofty walls, strong ramparts, watch-towers and gates. These cities contained pleasure parks, streets lighted with torches and watered, assembly halls, dancing halls, gambling houses, courts of justice, booths for traders and work-places of artisans. The number of big cities was not large. Early Buddhist texts refer to six such places—Champā (near Bhagalpur), Rājagṛiha (in the Patna district), Śrāvastī (Saheṭh-Maheṭh), Sāketa (Oudh), Kauśāmbī (near Allahābād), and Benares (Varanasi or Banaras) as flourishing in the days of the Buddha. Taxila is omitted in this list, either because it had not yet risen to greatness or because it was far away in the north-west. The city of Pāṭaliputra was founded after the death of the sage of the Śākyas. One of the capital cities, that of a kingless State, is expressly mentioned as a "little wattle and daub town", "a branch township" surrounded by jungles.

The royal residence in the Brāhmaṇical Sūtras is a modest structure probably built of wood. Buddhist texts refer to a palace of stone, but it was in fairyland. They also mention buildings of seven storeys in height (*sapta bhūmaka prāsāda*). It is suggested by a high authority that in early times the superstructure at least of all dwellings was either woodwork or brickwork. But certain texts refer to workers in stone who built houses with material from

the ruins of a former village. The imperial palace described in the epic is a noble mansion made of stone and metal and provided with arches and roofs supported by a thousand pillars.

The inner court of the palace contained playgrounds with flowers and fountains where the women amused themselves. Little princesses had their dolls, *pañchālikā*. They also played with a ball, *kanduka*, while the boys sported with a ball or hockey (*vīṭā*), which they rolled or tossed about. The usual recreations of women were singing, dancing and music. There was a dancing hall attached to almost every palace. Men, too, are represented by Greek authors as being very fond of singing and dancing. But the chief pastimes of knights were gambling, hunting, listening to tales of war, and tournaments in amphitheatres surrounded by platforms for spectators. Buddhist texts refer to acrobatic feats, combats of animals and a kind of primitive chess play.

The dress of the people of the Indus valley consisted of a tunic made of cotton and two other pieces of stuff, one thrown about their shoulders and the other twisted round their heads. Men wore ear-rings and dyed their beards. They used umbrellas and shoes. Women of the aristocratic class were decked with golden stars about their heads and a multitude of necklets and bangles set with precious gems. Girls of the same classes in the Gangetic region also wore necklaces besides waist-bands and anklets adorned with bells. They were gaudily attired in linen or yellow or red silk.

The early epic warrior did not feel much compunction in taking meat, but in the later epic the slaughter of animals in the manner of the Kshatriyas is regarded as cruel and ghoulish. The growing feeling of pity for animate beings is reflected in the exhortation "don't kill the guiltless cow", and the practice of substituting images of animals made out of meal for real living creatures. The ordinary fare of the Indians of the north-west borderland, according to Greek observers, consisted of pulpy rice and seasoned meat. These were served up on a gold dish placed on a table. The drinking of wine was not widely prevalent except on the occasion of religious festivals. People in upper Sind had a kind of Lacedaemonian common meal where they ate in public. Their food consisted of what was taken in the chase.

Social distinctions were becoming rigid, though the epic philosophers declared that "There was no distinction of caste. The whole of this universe was divine, having emanated from *Brahman*. Created equally by the supreme spirit men had on account of their deeds been divided into various castes." The

Greek writers note at the end of this period that the custom of the country prohibited intermarriage between the castes. Custom also prohibited anyone from exercising two trades, or from changing from one caste to another. The sophist only could come from any caste. Brāhmaṇical lawgivers developed the theory of defilement and laid a ban on certain kinds of food as being intrinsically unfit for consumption by the twice-born or upper castes. Others, when defiled by the touch of certain classes of men and women, were regarded as impure. The theory of mixed castes is produced so as to explain the presence of new communities like the *Yavanas*. But such a theory tacitly admits that intermarriage between the castes did take place, and was legally recognised, though it was looked upon with disfavour by some of the law-givers. Legal maxims were counsels of perfection which were not always followed in practice. Greek historians refer to the matrimonial alliance between an Indian king and a Greek potentate. They also draw attention to the political activities and militancy of the Brāhmaṇas in the lower Indus valley, and allude to the rise of a dynasty of barber origin in the valley of the Ganges. Purāṇic writers refer to marriages of Kshatriya kings with Śūdra women and the assumption of royal authority by the Śūdras. Cases of intermarriage between castes and change of caste and occupation are also found in the epic. An epic king marries a Brāhmaṇa girl. A Kshatriya prince is promoted to the rank of a Brāhmaṇa. A Brāhmaṇa warrior leads the Kuru host against the Pāṇḍus and chieftains of the Pañchāla country. A Kshatriya prince does not hesitate to embrace a Nishāda whom he calls his friend, and takes food from a Śavara woman who has already served several sages.

Buddhist writers acknowledge the existence of the four *varṇas* and numerous degraded tribes and low trades (*hīnajāti* and *hīna-śilpa*) besides aboriginal peoples, outcastes and slaves. They refer to pride of birth and taboos on intermarriage and inter-dining, especially with slave girls and outcastes. But they give the palm to the Kshatriya and, like some epic poets, usually regard character, and not birth or ceremonial purity, as the true test of caste. Like the epic poets again, they refer to a certain elasticity of caste rules in the matter of *connubium*, commensality and change of calling. Brāhmaṇas took wives from royal houses. Princes, priests and pedlars ate together and intermarried. Brāhmaṇas and Kshatriyas took to trade and menial work. Weavers became archers. It is clear that social divisions and economic occupations did not exactly coincide, though the texts testify to a natural predilection of artisans and traders for the ancestral calling.

Economic Condition

As already stated, the vast majority of the people seem to have preferred country life to residence in "towns covered with dust". The rural population consisted mainly of agriculturists and ranchmen, but we have also references to "craft villages" of carpenters, smiths and potters. Towns mainly attracted the ruling and commercial classes.

The simple rites of the *Gṛihya Sūtras*, such as "the furrow sacrifice" and "the threshing-floor sacrifice", testify to the importance of the agricultural population. The farmers lived in villages, the number of which was very large in every kingdom. Villages were largely autonomous, though under the suzerainty of the king who received certain dues that have already been specified above and sometimes claimed the right of appointing the headman or officials who collected the village dues for him. The king's right to agricultural land was probably limited to a share of its produce. The king could remit the tithe due to the Government or make it over to anyone he wished to favour. But even royal officials scrupulously avoided encroachment upon the rights of the peasant householders (*gṛihapati*).

Nearchos refers to the cultivation of lands in the north-west by a whole kinship. Each individual took what he needed out of the produce and the remnant was destroyed to discourage sloth. In the Ganges valley, the arable land of the village (*grāma-kshetra*) was split up into plots held by heads of houses who managed their own holdings but co-operated for purposes of fencing and irrigation under the guidance of the headman (*Bhojaka*, *Grāmika*). The holdings were usually small, but large estates farmed by Brāhmaṇas were known though they were very rare. The bigger holdings were to a great extent managed with the assistance of hired labour. Slaves were not kept in large numbers and were ordinarily employed as domestic servants.

The householders who had shares of the village field and constituted the village community have been described as peasant proprietors, but it is not clear whether they had any proprietary rights as against the community or could transfer their shares to outsiders. Sale or gift of land was not unknown in Oudh or South Bihār, but the recorded cases generally refer to big estates owned by priests or nobles, and not to the small holdings of the ordinary members of the village community.

The village peasants were a generally contented lot, and both men and women had the civic spirit to work for the common

good. The result of co-operation was seen in the construction of reservoirs and the laying out of irrigation canals. In spite of their best endeavours, however, villagers could not escape famine for all time. The calamity, however, was not of frequent occurrence and, when it did come, its area was restricted.

The rural population included, besides the village agriculturists, a considerable body of ranchmen who tended cattle. They avoided towns and villages and lived in cattle-ranches styled *ghosha*. Some of the cowboys roamed about with their flocks in forests and on the mountains. The herdsman was frequently employed to guard the royal cattle and to take the flocks of the village folk to the common grazing field beyond the cultivated lands.

Handicraftsmen constituted a large part of the population both in rural and urban areas. The number of callings was large and included workers in stone and ivory and painters of frescoes. In some of the industries a considerable degree of specialisation was reached. They were also, to a large extent, localised and limited to particular families, for there was a general tendency among artisans for the son to follow the paternal calling. Eighteen of the more important crafts were organised into guilds (*Śreṇī*, *Pūga*), each of which was presided over by a *Pramukha* (foreman), *Jyeshṭhaka* (elder) or *Śreshṭhin* (chief). We sometimes hear of a *Mahāśreshṭhin* or supreme chief, and *Anuśreshṭhin* or deputy chief. Above all the guild officials stood the *Bhāṇḍāgārika* who combined the post of State Treasurer with supreme headship over all the *Śreṇīs*.

It is doubtful if the full guild organisation had spread to seamen and traders. Some of them had a *Jyeshṭhaka* (elder) or a *Sārthavāha* (caravan-leader) and worked in union under a *Śreshṭhin*. But subordination to the leader or elder was not always in evidence, and merchants often plied their trade alone.

The range of activities of sailors and merchants in the period represented by the Pāli texts whose exact date is unknown was wide. We hear of sea-voyages and of trading journeys to the coast of Burma and the Malay world (*Suvarṇa-bhūmi*), Ceylon (*Tāmraparṇī*) and even to Babylon (*Baveru*). But navigators for the most part trafficked up and down the great rivers, especially the Indus, the Ganges and its tributaries. The principal sea-ports were Bhṛigukachcha (Broach), Śūrpāraka (Sopara, north of Bombay) and perhaps Tāmralipti (Tamluk in West Bengal). Of the riparian ports, Sahajāti (in Central India), Kauśāmbī on the Jumnā, Benares, Champā (near Bhagalpur), and latterly Pāṭaliputra on the Ganges and Pattala on the Indus deserve special mention. The great inland routes mostly radiated from Benares and Śrāvasti

One great highway connected the chief industrial and commercial centres of the Ganges valley with Central and Western Asia by way of the prosperous city of Taxila. Another stretched from Rājagṛiha in South Bihār by way of Śrāvastī in Oudh to the banks of the Godāvarī. Still another, and a far more difficult, route lay across the desert of Rājputāna to the ports of Sauvīra in the lower Indus valley and of the Upper Deccan near the mouth of the Narmadā. Adventurous merchants were guided along this route with difficulty by land-pilots who kept to the right track by observing the stars.

The chief articles of trade were silk, muslin, embroidery, ivory, jewellery and gold. The system of barter had not died out altogether, but the use of coins as the medium of exchange was becoming general. The standard unit of value was the copper *Kārshāpaṇa*, weighing a little more than 146 grains. Silver coins were also in circulation. King Āmbhi of Taxila presented Alexander with two hundred talents of coined silver. The weight of a silver Kārshāpaṇa, also called *Purāṇa* or *Dharaṇa*, was a little more than 58 grains, which is one-tenth of that of the *Nishka* or *Śatamāna* known to the Vedic texts. The weight and relative value of coins seem to have varied in different localities.

Religion

From the point of view of religion, the early days of the Magadhan ascendancy were among the most eventful in Indian history. Great changes took place within the fold of Brāhmaṇism. Old ideas changed. New ones sprang into vigorous life. Popular cults and beliefs obtained recognition at the hands of the upper classes, and humanitarian and theistic movements gathered force and momentum as popular faith in animal sacrifice and barren ritual tended to diminish with the growth of free speculation presaged in the Upanishads. Outside the Brāhmaṇical Holy Land, spiritual leadership passed from the hands of priestly theologians and sacrificers to ascetics and wanderers (*Śramaṇa*, *Parivrājaka*) who laid the utmost stress on non-injury to living beings and the cessation of craving for the things of the world.

Greek references to the worship of Zeus Ombrios (Zeus of the rain-storms) probably suggest that the Vedic rain-gods like Indra and Parjanya were still honoured in North-West India. It is to be noted that the deities in question figure prominently in the ritual of the *Gṛihya Sūtras*. Parjanya finds mention also in the Buddhist *Suttantas*, which probably describe conditions in the

north-east, but the place of Indra was there occupied by Śakra who is co-partner with Brahmā in the lordship over the gods. Brāhmaṇical texts refer to the growing popularity of Vaiśravana, Kumāra (Kārttikeya), and the goddesses Umā-Haimavatī and Vaśinī who are regarded as different aspects of Durgā, the mother-goddess, consort of Śiva. Side by side with these divinities appear the spirits dwelling in waters, herbs, trees, etc. The mention of Vaiśravaṇa points to the influence of the *Yaksha* cult, the popularity of which is attested both by epic and Buddhist evidence. The cult of trees and of water deities like the Ganges is noted by Curtius and Strabo, and the idea of the *Kalpa-vṛiksha*, the tree which will give a man all he wants, occurs prominently in literature, including that of the Jainas.

Most of the deities are now thoroughly anthropomorphised and become quite human in dress, talk and action. With the growth of anthropomorphism came the increased use of images and the construction of temples for daily service. Icons were known to the ancient people of the lower Indus valley, and stray allusions to images have been traced in some Vedic texts. But the first undoubted historical reference to image-worship by an Aryan tribe occurs in a passage of Curtius, who states that an image of Herakles was carried in front of the Paurava army as it advanced against Alexander. Patanjali refers to the exhibition and sale of images of Śiva, Skanda, and Viśākha by the Mauryas who rose to power at the end of our period. Temples of a primitive kind are mentioned already in the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, but these were not meant for iconic worship. In the epic, however, we have clear references to temples sacred to deities.

Blood sacrifices were sometimes offered to some of the gods, but all our authorities bear testimony to a new feeling of pity for living beings. The *Mahābhārata* refers to the rescue by Pāndu princes, led by Kṛishṇa, of hundreds of kings who were kept for sacrifice in the fortress of Girivraja "as mighty elephants are kept in mountain caves by the lion". The *Gṛihya Sūtras* prescribe rules for the substitution of images of meal at a sacrifice for real living creatures. Greek and Latin observers note that Brāhmaṇas do not eat the flesh of animals which help man in his labours. The remark undoubtedly confirms the Indian evidence regarding the growing feeling of reverence for the cow. The doctrine of *Ahiṁsā* or non-injury was specially inculcated by the ascetics and wanderers who had great influence over the people especially in Eastern India. An interesting glimpse of the ascetics of Taxila

is afforded by the account of Onesikritos who accompanied Alexander to that city in 326 B.C.

Among the most important religious concepts of the period, a prominent place should be assigned to the doctrines of *Saṁsāra* and *Karma*, i.e. belief in repeated transmigration and the Law of the Deed. The whole world is conceived as a "perpetual process of creation, destruction and re-birth filling eternity with an everlasting rhythm", and the entire scheme is placed under the Law of *Karma* which secures that every individual shall reap the fruit of deeds performed in antecedent existences. The operation of the Law might, however, be modified by the grace (*prasāda*) of the Lord, the Ordainer (*Īśvara, Dhātṛi*), combined with the loving faith (*Bhakti*) of the worshipper. This new doctrine is preached among others by the Vāsudevakas, later called *Bhāgavatas*. They teach *Bhakti* in Vāsudeva, also known as Kṛishṇa Devakīputra, who is identified in an Arāṇyaka with Vishṇu and Nārāyaṇa. He is represented as preaching the doctrines of *nishkāma Karma* (deed done without seeking any reward) and loving faith (*Bhakti*) in a God of Grace (*prasāda*). The religious and philosophical views of his followers are expounded in the *Bhagavad Gītā* which forms part of the sixth book of the *Mahābhārata*. *Bhaktas* of Vāsudeva were known to Pāṇini, and are probably to be identified with the worshippers of the Indian Herakles whose cult was specially popular with the Śūrasenas of Mathurā in the fourth century B.C.

Rival sects also make their appearance, the most notable being the devotees of Śiva, later called the Śīva-Bhāgavatas, Māheśvaras or Pāśupatas. In one of the later Upanishads—the Śvetāśvatara—Śiva is the lord (Īśa or Īśāna) of the universe—the *Bhagavat* or the Blessed One, the object of devotion to the faithful. By devoting oneself to him, ignorance is dispelled, the nooses of death are snapped and eternal peace is attained.

The new theistic sects, though preserving their distinct individuality, did not break away altogether from Brāhmaṇism, and attempts at a synthesis were made in the epics and later literature whereby the gods of the Bhāgavatas and the Pāśupatas or Śiva-Bhāgavatas were recognised as emanations of the supreme divinity of Brāhmaṇism. This leads to the enunciation of the doctrine of *Trimūrti* which, in its mature form, belongs to a later age.

Eastern India saw the rise of a class of wandering teachers who, though believing in the doctrine of transmigration and *Karma*, rejected the authority of the Vedas and of Vedic priests, denounced the blood sacrifices that constituted so large a part of the Brāhmaṇic ritual, and even denied the existence of God and

consequently the efficacy of divine grace. Right conduct, they declared, was the way of getting out of the meshes of *Karma* and *Saṁsāra*, and this right conduct included, among other things, the practice of *Ahiṁsā* or non-injury to living beings.

It is a notable fact that the greatest of the wandering teachers were, like the lord of the *Bhāgavatas*, scions of free Kshatriya clans hailing from the territory that lies on the fringe of the Brāhmaṇical Holy Land. One of them, Vardhamāna Mahāvīra, belonged to the Jñātrika clan of Kuṇḍapura or Kuṇḍagrāma, a suburb of Vaiśālī in North Bihār. The other, Gautama Buddha, was a prince of the Śākya clan of Kapilavastu near Rummindei in the Nepāl Tarai.

Mahāvīra and Jainism

The parents of Mahāvīra were Siddhārtha, a Jñātrika chief of Kuṇḍapura, and Triśalā, a Kshatriya lady related to the ruling families of Vaiśālī and Magadha. The early life of Mahāvīra is veiled in obscurity. According to the tradition of the Śvetāmbara (white-robed) Jainas, he married a princess named Yaśodā. He lived for some time the life of a pious householder, but forsook the world at the age of thirty. He roamed as a naked ascetic in several countries of eastern India and practised severe penance for twelve years. For half the period he lived with a mendicant friar named Gosāla who subsequently left him and became the leader of the *Ājīvika* sect. In the thirteenth year of his penance, Mahāvīra repaired to the northern bank of the river Rijupālikā outside Jṛimbhikagrāma, a little-known locality in eastern India, and attained the highest spiritual knowledge called *Kevala-jñāna*. He was now a *Kevalin* (omniscient), a *Jina* (conqueror) and *Mahāvīra* (the great hero). He became the head of a sect called Nirgranthas ("free from fetters"), known in later times as Jainas or followers of the Jina (conqueror). For thirty years he wandered about as a religious teacher and died at Pāvā in South Bihār at the age of seventy-two. The event is said to have happened 215 years before the Mauryas and 470 years before Vikrama. This is usually taken to refer to 528 B.C. But 468 B.C. is preferred by some modern scholars who rely on a tradition recorded by the Jaina monk Hemachandra that the interval between Mahāvīra's death and the accession of Chandragupta Maurya was 155, and not 215, years. The latter date does not accord with the explicit statement in some of the earliest Buddhist texts that Mahāvīra predeceased the Buddha. The earlier date is also beset with difficulties, and no definite conclusion is possible.

The Jainas believe that Mahāvīra was not the founder of a new religious system, but the last of a long succession of twenty-four *Tīrthaṅkaras* or "ford-makers across the stream of existence". The twenty-third teacher, Pārśva, the immediate predecessor of Mahāvīra, seems to have been a historical figure. He was a prince of Benares, and he enjoined on his disciples the four great vows of non-injury, truthfulness, abstention from stealing and non-attachment. To these Mahāvīra added the vow of *Brahmacharya* or continence. He also emphasised the need of discarding all external things, including garments, if complete freedom from bonds is to be attained. By following the three-fold path of Right Belief, Right Knowledge, and Right Conduct, souls will be released from transmigration and reach the pure and blissful abode (*Siddha Śilā*) which is the goal of Jaina aspiration. There is no place in Jainism for a supreme creative spirit. The doctrine of non-injury is given a wide extension by attributing souls not only to birds and beasts but also to plants, metals, water, etc.

According to the tradition of the *Śvetāmbara* Jainas, the original doctrine taught by Mahāvīra was contained in fourteen old texts styled *Pūrvas*. Towards the close of the fourth century B.C., when a famine in South Bihār led to the exodus of an important section of the Jainas, headed by Bhadrabāhu, to the Mysore country, those that remained behind in Pāṭaliputra convoked a council with a view to reviving the knowledge of the sacred texts which was passing into oblivion. The result was the compilation of the twelve *Aṅgas* which are regarded as the most important part of the Jaina canon. Another council was held at Valabhī in Gujarāt in the fifth or sixth century A.D. which made a final collection of the scriptures and reduced them to writing. The complete canon included not only the *Aṅgas*, but sundry other treatises styled *Upāṅga*, *Mūla Sūtra*, etc.

The followers of Bhadrabāhu, on their return to the north, refused to acknowledge the canon as drawn up by their co-religionists at home, who came to be known as *Śvetāmbaras* (clad in white) as they wore white garments notwithstanding the injunctions of Mahāvīra. Those who continued to follow scrupulously the directions of the famous Jñātrika teacher regarding nudity, came to be called *Digambaras* (sky-clad or naked). The division of the Jaina Church into these two sects is at least as old as the first century A.D. But it may be much older, and some scholars find in the followers of Pārśva, the Tīrthaṅkara who immediately preceded Mahāvīra, the precursors of the Śvetāmbaras of later ages.

Gautama Buddha

Among the notable contemporaries of Mahāvīra was a wandering teacher who belonged to the Śākya clan of Kapilavastu in the Nepāl Tarai to the north of the Basti district of the Uttar Pradesh. His name was Siddhārtha and he belonged to the Gautama *gotra* or family. He was born in the village of Lumbinigrāma near Kapilavastu about the year 566 B.C. according to the system of chronology adopted in these pages. The site of his nativity is marked by the celebrated Rummindeī Pillar of Aśoka Maurya. He was the son of Śuddhodana, a Rājā or noble of Kapilavastu, and of Māyā, a princess of Devadaha, a small town in the Śākya territory. Māyā died in child-birth and the little Siddhārtha was brought up by his aunt and stepmother P(r)ajāpatī Gautamī. At the age of sixteen the prince was married to a lady known to tradition as Bhadda Kachchānā, Yaśodharā, Subhadrakā, Bimbā or Gopā, whom some authorities represent as a niece of Māyā. After his marriage, Siddhārtha grew up amidst the luxurious surroundings of the palace till at last the vision of old age, disease and death made him realise the hollowness of worldly pleasure. He felt powerfully attracted by the calm serenity of the passion-less recluse, and the birth of a son, Rāhula, made him decide to leave his home and family at once. The Great Renunciation took place when Siddhārtha reached the age of twenty-nine. For six years he lived as a homeless ascetic, seeking instruction under two religious teachers and visiting many places including Rājagṛiha, in the Patna district, and Uruvilva, near Gayā. At Uruvilva he practised the most rigid austerities only to find that they were of no help to him in reaching his goal. He then took a bath in the stream of the river Nairanjanā, modern Lilajan, and sat under a *pipal* tree at modern Bodh-Gayā. Here at last he attained unto supreme knowledge and insight and became known as the *Buddha* or the Enlightened One, Tathāgata ("he who had attained the truth") and Śākya-muni or the sage of the Śākya clan.

The Enlightened One now proceeded to the Deer Park near Sarnath in the neighbourhood of Benares and began to preach his doctrine For forty-five years he roamed about as a wandering teacher and proclaimed his gospel to the princes and people of Oudh, Bihār and some adjoining territories. He laid the foundation of the Buddhist Order of monks (*Saṅgha*) and received important gifts of groves and monasteries from friendly rulers and citizens. Among his converts was his cousin Devadatta who subsequently broke away from him and founded a rival sect that survived in parts of Oudh and Western Bengal till the Gupta period. Th

Buddha is said to have died at the age of eighty at Kuśinagara, modern Kasia in the Gorakhpur district of the Uttar Pradesh. The date of his Great Decease (*Parinirvāṇa*) is a subject of keen controversy. If the Ceylonese tradition that 218 years intervened between the *Parinirvāṇa* and the consecration of *Priyadarśana* (Aśoka) has any value, the date cannot be far removed from 486 B.C., the starting-point of the famous "dotted record" at Canton.

Buddha taught his followers the four "Noble Truths" (*Ārya Satya*) concerning suffering, the cause of suffering, the destruction of suffering and the way that leads to the destruction of sorrow. That way did not lie either in habitual practice of sensuality or in habitual practice of self-torture. There was a "Middle Path" called the "Noble Eightfold-path", that is to say, Right Views, Right Aspirations, Right Speech, Right Conduct, Right Livelihood, Right Effort, Right Mindfulness and Right Contemplation. This was the path that "opened the eyes, bestowed understanding, led to peace of mind, to the higher wisdom, to full enlightenment, to Nirvāṇa". Nirvāṇa literally means "the blowing out" or extinction of craving, of the desire for existence in all its forms, and the consequent cessation of suffering. But it is not mere extinction. It is a tranquil state to be realised by one who "from all craving want was free".

In his last exhortation to his disciples just on the eve of his death, the Buddha said, "Decay is inherent in all component things. Work out your salvation with diligence (*apramāda*)."

The striving for salvation requires in the first place the observance of the *Śīlas* or Moralities, that is to say, abandonment of killing, stealing, incontinence, falsehood, slander, luxury, hankering for wealth, performance of blood sacrifices, and sundry other practices. The next requisite is *Samādhi* or concentration, and finally *Prajñā* or insight. These ultimately lead to *Sambodhi* (enlightenment) and *Nirvāṇa*.

The Buddhists shared with their fellow-countrymen of other persuasions, including the Brāhmaṇical Hindus and the Jainas, the belief in *Saṁsāra* (transmigration) and *Karma* (retribution for the deed done). Like the Jainas, they rejected the authority of the Vedas, condemned blood sacrifices, denied or doubted the existence of a supreme creative spirit, and inculcated reverence for saints who, from their point of view, attained to supreme knowledge. But unlike the followers of the Jñātrika teacher they did not acknowledge a permanent entity or an immortal soul, were not convinced of the efficacy of discarding garments, and considered

rigid penance to be as useless as indulgence in sensual pleasure. The disciples of Mahāvīra on the other hand, endowed even plants, metals, water and air with souls and gave a wide extension to the doctrine of non-violence. They considered all external things, including garments, to be an impediment to spiritual progress, and believed that the ideal man should lead a life of rigid austerities, putting up with all sorts of torments and tribulations, never seeking any relief. The saints and prophets of Jainism were of a different type from the saints and prophets of Buddhism, and the Jainas did not altogether dispense with the worship of the old deities or the services of the Brāhmaṇas.

Buddhist Scriptures

The unanimous tradition of all Buddhist schools records that shortly after the death of the Master a great Council (*Saṅgīti*) was held at Rājagṛiha to compile the *Dharma* (religious doctrine) and the *Vinaya* (monastic code). A century later a dispute arose regarding the code of discipline as the monks of Vaiśālī wanted a relaxation of the rules in respect of ten points. A second council was convoked at Vaiśālī which condemned the ten heresies and revised the scriptures. A fresh condemnation of heresy is said to have taken place in the reign of Aśoka Maurya, under whose patronage a third council was summoned at Pāṭaliputra by a learned monk, Tissa Moggaliputta, 236 years after the death of the Buddha, to make a final compilation of the scriptures. The council of Pāṭaliputra was probably not a plenary assembly of all Buddhists, but a party meeting of the school of *Vibhajjavādins*. A fourth council was held under Kanishka which prepared elaborate commentaries (*Upadeśa Śāstras* and *Vibhāshā Śāstras*) on the sacred texts. This council was also not a general assembly but probably a gathering of only the *Hinayānists* of Northern India.

The tradition about some of the earlier councils is not accepted by all scholars. But the unanimity of tradition about the first two assemblies and Aśoka's decrees against heretical monks indicate that there must have been a substratum of truth behind the stories narrated by the Chroniclers. The canon as we have it at present may not be as old as the first or even the second council. One text, the *Kathāvatthu*, is admittedly a work of the third century B.C. But quotations from scriptures in the Aśokan edicts, and references to persons well read in the sacred texts in inscriptions of the second century B.C., suggest that works on doctrine and

discipline were current before the rise of the Maurya and Śuṅga dynasties, though such works may not be exactly identical with any of the extant texts. According to the Ceylonese tradition, the sacred texts and commentaries were written down in books in the first century B.C. during the reign of King Vaṭṭagāmani Abhaya. In the fifth century A.D. the texts, as distinguished from the commentaries, came to be known as *Pāli*. The use of the term *Pāli* to denote the *language* in which the texts were written is not warranted by any early evidence. The *language* was called *Māgadhānām Nirutti* or the idiom of the people of Magadha, which was probably a dialect spoken in Magadha in the early days of Buddhism and which had ceased to be the current speech in the days of Aśoka who used a somewhat different idiom in his inscriptions.

The *Pāli* Canon is divided into three *Piṭakas* or baskets, viz. the *Sutta*, the *Vinaya*, and the *Abhidhamma*. The first consists of five *Nikāyas* or collections of *Suttas* or *Suttantas*, i.e. religious discourses. The second contains rules of monastic discipline, and the third contains disquisitions of a philosophical character. The fifth *Nikāya* of the *Sutta-Piṭaka* includes the famous *Dhammapada*, the psalms of the brethren and of the sisters (*Theragāthā* and *Therīgāthā*) and the still more celebrated *Jātakas* or Buddhist Birth Stories. The extant *Jātaka* commentaries belong to a period much later than the rise of the Maurya dynasty, but the original stories are fairly old and are often illustrated in bas-reliefs of the second and first centuries B.C. They were apparently not so well-known in the second as in the first century B.C. The *Jātakas* belong to a class of literature which foreshadows the epic, and there are indications that the epic itself was assuming coherent shape during the early days of the Magadhan ascendancy.

The Beginnings of Epic Poetry

In Vedic literature we come across lays in praise of heroes and tales about the deeds of princes and sages. These hero-lauds (*gāthā nārāśaṁsī*) and narrative stories (*ākhyāna*) formed an important feature of great sacrifices like the *Rājasūya* (royal consecration) and the *Aśvamedha* (horse-sacrifice). In the horse-sacrifice, a priest recited the *pariplava ākhyāna* (circling narrative) and tales of ancient kings, while a Kshatriya lute-player (*viṇā-gāthin*) sang to the lute extempore verses which referred to victories connected with the sacrificer. Among such sacrificers were many kings of the Kuru and Kosala realms. It is, therefore, not sur-

prising that some of the most famous lays and tales found in the Vedic texts celebrated the benevolence and prowess of Kuru kings like Parikshit and Janamejaya, and of Ikshvāku and Kosalan monarchs like Hariśchandra and Para Āṭnāra. The narration of the Ākhyāna of the Ikshvāku Hariśchandra formed a part of the ritual of the *Rājasūya*, and another rite of the same sacrifice was connected with an important episode of Kuru history. The popularity of such stories is attested by Buddhist scriptures, and the Buddha strongly reprobated the practice of narrating tales of kings, of war, and of terror, in which certain Brāhmaṇas and even ascetics indulged. Some of the Ikshvāku and Kuru lays and tales centred round heroes not explicitly mentioned in the extant Vedic texts. One such story, that of Daśaratha and his son Rāma of the Ikshvāku family, is alluded to in the *Jātaka gāthās* and illustrated in bas-reliefs of the second century B.C. Another tale, that of the Pāṇḍus, is also known to the *Jātaka gāthās* and is hinted at by Greek writers of the fourth century B.C. in the confused legends about the Indian Herakles and Pandia. Moreover, it is alluded to by the grammarians Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali. The last-mentioned writer also shows some acquaintance with the Kishkindhyā episode of the Rāma story. It is, however, difficult to say when the ballads about Rāma's adventures or the Pāṇḍus' victory first assumed the form of a full-fledged heroic *Kāvya* or epic. The names of Vālmiki and Vyāsa, son of Parāśara, the reputed authors of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the Pāṇḍu epic, the *Mahābhārata*, seem to occur in certain later Vedic or Vedāṅga texts. But the first dated reference to the *Rāmāyaṇa* as an epic is contained in the works of Buddhist and Jaina writers of the earliest centuries of the Christian era. But even then it contained only 12,000 verses, i.e. only half of its present size. The *Mahābhārata* is first mentioned by Āśvalāyana in his *Gṛihya Sūtra* and by Pāṇini in his *Ashṭādhyāyī*. It was admittedly at first only about a quarter of its present size. The complete *Mahābhārata* of 100,000 verses is mentioned for the first time in an inscription of the Gupta period. By the sixth century A.D. the fame of both the epics had spread to far-off Cambodia. Both the poems contain a good deal of pseudo-epic or didactic material which came to be included at a comparatively late date. The genuine epic refers to a powerful Magadhan military State with its capital at Girivraja. There is no reference to Pāṭaliputra. This probably points to a date before the later Haryaṅka-Śaiśunāga kings for the early epic. The age of the epic cannot be pushed much farther back because the knowledge, however inadequate, of Southern India

beyond the Godāvarī, and of Eastern India beyond the land of the Puṇḍras and the Vaṅgas, betrays a geographical outlook that is distinctly wider than that of the entire Vedic canon and the early Buddhist Nikāyas. Of the two ancient Sanskrit epics the *Rāmāyaṇa* is alluded to in, and was probably completed before, the extant *Mahābhārata*. But while the *Mahābhārata* was known to Āśvalāyana and Pāṇini, there is no similar early reference to the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The latter epic, moreover, mentions Janamejaya and "Vishṇu who upraised a mountain with his hands", i.e. probably Kṛishṇa. The latest books refer to Vāsudeva of the Yadu family and his close associate, the incarnation of Nara, i.e. Arjuna.

The nucleus of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is the story of Rāma, the eldest son of Daśaratha, a prince of the Ikshvāku family of Ayodhyā in the Fyzabad district of Uttar Pradesh. The prince married Sītā, the daughter of Janaka, king of Videha in North Bihār. Owing to a palace intrigue, the Ikshvāku prince had to leave his home and go into exile for a period of fourteen years. He repaired to the Daṇḍaka forest in the Deccan with his wife and faithful half-brother Lakshmaṇa. He dwelt for some time on the banks of the Godāvarī in Pañchavaṭī, which is usually identified with Nāsik. Here he came into conflict with the *Rākshasas* or cannibal chieftains who were a source of disturbance to the peaceful hermits of the locality. Among the hostile chieftains were some persons closely related to Rāvaṇa, the mighty king of Laṅkā (Ceylon). That potentate avenged his injured relations by carrying off Sītā, wife of Rāma, to his island home. In their distress, the Ikshvāku princes allied themselves with Sugrīva, Hanumān and other monkey chiefs of Kishkindhyā in the Bellary district of South India and crossed over to Laṅkā. They killed the *Rākshasa* king with most of his clan and rescued the princess Sītā. As the period of Rāma's exile was now over, he returned with his wife and brother to Ayodhyā where he was warmly received by his half-brother Bharata in whose favour he had been made to relinquish his rights. Meanwhile people came to question the propriety of taking back a princess who had long been kept confined by a *Rākshasa* king. To silence the unreasonable clamour of the multitude, Rāma had to banish his faithful consort, the ideal of Indian womanhood. The duty of a *Rājā*, according to Hindu notions, was always to please his subjects who were his "children". The virtuous royal lady found a shelter in the hermitage of Vālmiki, where she gave birth to the twins, Kuśa and Lava, who subsequently returned to their ancestral home and succeeded to their heritage.

It is difficult to say if there is any kernel of historical truth

underneath this tale of a prince's adventures in the land of cannibals and monkeys. Rāma and Sītā are names met with in the Vedic literature, though not always as appellations of human beings. They are, however, in no way connected in the Vedic texts with the illustrious lines of the Ikshvākus or the Videhas. The name of Rāvaṇa is absolutely unknown to Brāhmaṇical or non-Brāhmaṇical literature till we come to the epics themselves or to works like the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*, which show acquaintance with the epics. It is, however, possible that Ikshvāku princes played a leading part in the colonisation of the Far South of India, as names of Ikshvāku kings figure prominently in the early inscriptions of Southern India. Whether the name of Ikshvāku was first popularised in the south by princes from Ayodhyā or by followers of the Śākya teacher of Kapilavastu, who also claimed Ikshvāku descent, must remain an open question.

The kernel of the *Mahābhārata* seems to be the victory of the Pāṇḍus, helped by Kṛishṇa and the Pañchālas, over the Kurus proper, the sons of Dhṛitarāshṭra Vaichitravīrya, a king mentioned already in the *Kāṭhaka* recension of the *Yajur Veda*. The epic is often mentioned as the "tale of victory" (*Jayanāma itihāsa*). Of the leading figures on the side of the victors the name of one, Kṛishṇa, son of Vasudeva and Devakī, is mentioned in the *Chhāndogya Upanishad* and the latest book of the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*. In the latter text he is identified with the god Vishṇu or Nārāyaṇa. The name of another victor, Arjuṇa, is alluded to in the Vājasaneyi recension of the *Yajur Veda* and the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*. In the *Brāhmaṇa* he is identified with Indra, and in the epic he is the son of Indra. But the *Brāhmaṇa* identification of Arjuna with Indra is on a par with the identification in the *Āraṇyaka* of Vāsudeva, i.e. Kṛishṇa, son of Vasudeva, with Vishṇu, and cannot be adduced to support the view that he was from the beginning nothing but a Brāhmaṇic god. The ruin of the Kurus is hinted at in the *Chhāndogya Upanishad* and one of the *Śrauta Sūtras*. Among their principal enemies were the *Sriñjayas*, and the Kuru hostility to this people is alluded to in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.

According to the story related in the *Mahābhārata*, King Vichitravīrya of Hāstinapura, in the Kuru country, identified with a place in the Meerut district, had sons named Dhṛitarāshṭra and Pāṇḍu. Dhṛitarāshṭra was born blind and hence Pāṇḍu succeeded to the throne. He died in the lifetime of his elder brother, leaving five sons, Yudhishṭhira, Bhīmasena, Arjuna, Nakula and Sahadeva. Dhṛitarāshṭra had more than a hundred

children, of whom the eldest was Duryodhana. The sons of Pāṇḍu married Draupadī, daughter of the king of Pañchāla. The third prince, Arjuna, married also Subhadrā, sister to Kṛishṇa who belonged to the powerful Yādava confederacy of Mathurā and Dvārakā (in Kāṭhiāwār). The Pāṇḍus claimed a share of their paternal kingdom. They were given the Khāṇḍava forest to the south of the Kuru kingdom, where they built the stately city of Indraprastha near modern Delhi. At the instance of Kṛishṇa they overthrew Jarāsandha, the powerful king of Magadha, who was seeking to establish his own supremacy. The Magadhan ruler had carried off hundreds of princes as prisoners to the fastness of Girivraja with a view to offering them as victims in a horrid rite. The Pāṇḍus now effected conquests in all directions and laid claim to the rank of paramount rulers, performing the *Rājasūya*, which was now a sacrifice of imperial inauguration. The prosperity of their rivals roused the jealousy of the sons of Dhṛitarāshṭra. They invited Yudhishṭhira, the eldest among the Pāṇḍu princes, to a game of dice, secured his defeat, and sought to enslave Draupadī. The Pāṇḍu queen was dragged to the open court and there subjected to the grossest insults. The Pāṇḍus were next sent into exile for a period of thirteen years. At the end of the period the five brothers demanded the return of their kingdom but met with a refusal. Thereupon the rival cousins engaged in a deadly conflict on the field of Kurukshetra. The Kuru host, led by Bhīshma, Droṇa, Karṇa and other mighty warriors, was destroyed. The Pāṇḍus with their allies, the Pañchālas and Sṛiñjayas, also suffered terrible losses, but they succeeded in gaining back their kingdom.

Although there is no clear reference in the extant Vedic texts to the battle of Kurukshetra, we have distinct hints in some of the *Brāhmaṇas*, *Upanishads* and *Śrauta Sūtras* of the hostility between the Kurus and the Sṛiñjayas, the disasters threatening the Kurus and their final expulsion from Kurukshetra. The name Pāṇḍu is not mentioned in Vedic literature, but we have references to Arjuna, Parikshit and Janamejaya, and the first two have already been deified in some of the later Vedic texts. That the Pāṇḍus were a historic tribe or clan is proved by the testimony of Ptolemy in whose time they occupied a portion of the Punjab.

Both the Kurus and the Pāṇḍus are frequently represented by epic bards as violating the knightly code of honour. The unchivalrous deeds of the Pāṇḍus are often attributed by the Kuru chronicler to the instigation of Kṛishṇa, just as the misdeeds of Ajātaśatru are ascribed by Buddhist writers to Devadatta, the schismatic cousin of the Buddha. The Buddha himself is accused

by Purāṇic chroniclers of having beguiled the demons. The Bhāgavatas, the followers of Krishṇa, were not regarded as quite orthodox even in the time of Śaṅkarāchārya, and that may account for the attitude that a section of the Kuru bards adopted towards the Yādava chief, whom they regarded as a *vrātya* (outside the pale). It is difficult to believe that the great poets, philosophers and devoted worshippers who produced the *Bhagavad Gītā* and laid the utmost stress on the virtues of *dama* (self-restraint), *tyāga* (renunciation) and *apramāda* (vigilance) in an inscription of the second century B.C., could have been aware of the dark deeds that are attributed to their lord and his closest associates in battle-songs that find a place in the extant epic. That some of the battle-books were revised at a later period is proved by references to the Yavanas and the Śakas.

The *Mahābhārata* is not merely a "song of victory", it is a *Purāna-Saṁhitā*, a collection of old legends, and an *Itivritta* or traditional account of high-souled kings and pious sages, of dutiful wives and beautiful maids. We have charming and edifying stories like those of Śakuntalā and Sāvitrī, of Nala and Śibi. Side by side with these we have the thrilling lays of Ambā and Vidulā. In the first book the epic claims to be a *Śāstra* or authoritative manual laying down rules of conduct for the attainment of *trivarga* or the three great aims animating all human conduct, *Dharma* (moral and religious duties), *Artha* (material wealth) and *Kāma* (pleasures of the flesh). Finally it claims to be a *Moksha-śāstra* pointing the way of salvation to mankind. Manuals of a didactic character are chiefly found in the later books. Among the religious poems that form part of the epic, the most famous is the *Bhagavad Gītā* or the "Song of the Lord", which constitutes the bed-rock of Hindu theism.

CHAPTER VII

THE MAURYA EMPIRE

Chandragupta Maurya

In 326 B.C. India was faced with a crisis. The imperial crown of Magadha and the neighbouring provinces was worn by a king who was "detested and held cheap" by his own people. The Land of the Five Rivers was overrun by the Macedonians and allied peoples from the West who resolved to incorporate it permanently into their growing empire. Alexander, the great leader of the invading bands, withdrew, it is true, to the city of Babylon in Mesopotamia, where he died in 323 B.C. Philippos, the satrap whom he had appointed to govern the Western Punjab, met his doom in 324 B.C. But the surviving commanders, who met to partition the Macedonian empire in 323 B.C. and again in 321 B.C., had no desire to withdraw altogether from the conquered territories in the Indian borderland. The civil government of the districts to the east of the Indus had to be left virtually in the hands of Indian princes. Macedonian governors were retained in the trans-Indus satrapies, and an officer, named Eudemos, was appointed to command the garrison in the Western Punjab after the murder of Philippos. The successors of Alexander were, however, torn by internal dissensions and had to recall some of their commandants in India. The indigenous population had, in the meantime, found a leader who knew how to take advantage of the disunion and the thinned ranks of the foreign invaders and "shake the yoke of servitude from the neck" of his fatherland.

Signs of disaffection against foreign rule appeared in the Indian borderland as early as 326 B.C. when the Macedonian king was still in the Punjab. A formidable rising followed in the lower Indus valley which was fomented by the Brāhmaṇas of the locality. But all these insurrections seem to have been crushed, and the hand of the invader fell heavily on the instigators. Retribution came quickly and, if tradition is to be believed, it was a Taxilian Brāhmaṇa named Chāṇakya or Kauṭilya who raised to power the great avenger to whose mighty arms "the earth, long harassed by outlanders, now turned for protection and refuge"

The new Indian leader was a young man who bore the name of Chandragupta. He is described by Justin as a man of humble origin who was prompted to aspire to regal power by an omen significant of an august destiny, immediately after an encounter with Alexander himself. The visit to the Macedonian king is referred to by Plutarch as well as Justin, but, strange to say, some modern writers emend the text of Justin and propose to read "Nandrum" (Nanda) in place of "Alexandrum" (Alexander). Such conjectural emendations are hardly justified.

The family to which the young leader belonged is named Maurya by Indian writers, and is identified by some with the tribe of Morieis mentioned by the Greeks. According to one tradition the designation is derived from Murā, the mother or grandmother of Chandragupta, who was the wife of a Nanda king. Mediaeval epigraphs, on the other hand, represent the Mauryas as Kshatriyas of the solar race. Buddhist writers of an early date also knew them as members of the Kshatriya caste and referred to them as the ruling clan of the little republic of Pipphalivana, probably lying between Rummindeī in the Nepalese Tarai and Kasai in the Gorakhpur district, in the days of the Buddha. The cognomen *Vṛishala* applied to Chandragupta in the Sanskrit play called the *Mudrārākshasa* does not invariably mean a man of *Śūdra* extraction. It is also used of Kshatriyas and others who deviated from rules enjoined in Brāhmaṇical scriptures. That Chandragupta did deviate from Brāhmaṇical orthodoxy is proved by his predilection shown for Jainism in his later years.

The Maurya clan was reduced to great straits in the fourth century B.C., and tradition avers that Chandragupta grew up among peacock-tamers, herdsmen, and hunters. While still a lad he is said to have met Alexander in the Punjab, but, having offended the king by his boldness of speech, and orders being given to kill him, he saved himself by a speedy flight. In the place of his refuge he is said to have been joined by a personage who had left his home in Taxila. This was the famous Chāṇakya or Kautilya, who went at first to Pāṭaliputra but, being insulted by the reigning Nanda king, repaired to the Vindhya forest where he met Chandragupta. With the help of treasure found underground he gathered an army for the young Maurya. Greek and Latin writers do not mention Kauṭilya but allude to Chandragupta's encounter with a lion and an elephant, which accords well with his residence in the Vindhyan wilds, and refer to the collection of a body of armed men who are characterised as a band of robbers by some modern historians. But the original expression used by Justin, to whom

we owe the account of the rise of Chandragupta, has the sense of "mercenary soldier" as well as that of "robber". The former sense is in consonance with Jaina tradition.

Having collected an army, Chandragupta "solicited the Indians to support his new sovereignty", or, according to another interpretation, "instigated the Indians to overthrow the existing government". *Thereafter* (*deinde*) he went to war with the prefects of Alexander and fought vigorously with them. Chandragupta acquired the throne when Seleukos, a general of Alexander, was laying the foundations of his future greatness. Seleukos obtained as his share of Alexander's empire the satrapy of Babylon, first after the agreement of Triparadeisos (321 B.C.) and afterwards in 312 B.C., from which year his era is dated. In 306 B.C. he assumed the title of king. As Chandragupta had acquired the throne when Seleukos was on the threshold of his career, his accession took place certainly before 306 B.C. and probably before 312 B.C. It may have taken place even before 321 B.C. The Buddhist tradition of Ceylon puts the date 162 years after the *Parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha, i.e. in 382 B.C. if we take 544 B.C. to be the year of the Great Decease and 324 B.C. if we prefer the Cantonese date 486 B.C. for the death of the Buddha. The earlier date is opposed to Greek evidence and is clearly untenable. The date 324 B.C. accords with the testimony of Greek writers.

The first Maurya is known to have been in possession of Mālwa and Kāṭhiāwār. The Jaina date, 313 B.C., if based on a correct tradition, may refer to his acquisition of Avanti (Mālwa). Westward of Avanti, Chandragupta's rule extended as far as Surāshṭra in which was stationed a *Vaiśya* official (*rāshṭriya*) named Pushyagupta. Tamil tradition refers to the advance of "Maurya upstarts" as far south as the Tinnevelly district. But the achievement is attributed by certain scholars to the Mauryas of the Konkan who belong to a much later date. Even if the earlier Mauryas had really pushed on to Tinnevelly they must have withdrawn from this region within a short time, because the southern frontier of the Maurya empire in the days of Aśoka, grandson of Chandragupta, did not extend beyond the Chitaldrug district of Mysore, and the Pāṇḍya realm which included the Tinnevelly district is referred to in the edicts of that emperor as a frontier kingdom.

Towards the close of the reign of Chandragupta, the Maurya empire received a further extension in the north-west. Seleukos, the general of Alexander, who had made himself master of Babylon, gradually extended his empire from the Mediterranean Sea to the Indus and even tried to regain the provinces to the east of

that river. He failed and had to conclude a treaty with Chandragupta by which he surrendered a large territory including, in the opinion of certain writers, the satrapies of Paropanisadai (Kābul), Aria (Herāt), Arachosia (Qandahār), and Gedrosia (Baluchistān), in return for 500 elephants. The inclusion of a part at least of the Kābul valley within the Maurya empire is attested by the evidence of the Aśokan inscriptions. The treaty was probably cemented by a marriage contract. A Greek envoy was accredited to the Court of Pātaliputra.

If Jaina tradition is to be believed, Chandragupta was converted to the religion of Mahāvīra. He is said to have abdicated his throne and passed his last days at Śravaṇa Belgola in Mysore. Greek evidence, however, suggests that the first Maurya did not give up the performance of sacrificial rites and was far from following the Jaina creed of *Ahiṁsā* or non-injury to animals. He took delight in hunting, a practice that was continued by his son and was also alluded to by his grandson Aśoka in the eighth Rock Edict. It is, however, possible that in his last days he showed some predilection for Jainism just as Harsha in the seventh century A.D., though officially a Śaiva, paid respect to the Buddha and the Buddhist Master of the Law.

Bindusāra

The successor of Chandragupta Maurya was his son Bindusāra apparently called *Amitraghāta*, "slayer of foes", by Greek writers. He probably reigned from *c.* 300 B.C. to *c.* 273 B.C.

Bindusāra seems to have retained undiminished the empire of his father. Tradition credits him with the suppression of a revolt in Taxila. Whether he effected any new conquests is not known for certain. His empire must have embraced not only the greater part of northern India but also a considerable portion of the Deccan, probably as far south as the Chitaldrug district of Mysore. The kingdom of Kaliṅga, embracing the major part of Puri, Ganjam and some adjoining tracts, is known, however, to have been independent.

In foreign affairs Bindusāra maintained the friendly relations with the Hellenic West established by his father. He received as ambassador a Greek named Deimachos and curious anecdotes have been preserved of private friendly correspondence between him and Antiochos I Soter, king of Syria, son of Seleukos Nikator.

Bindusāra had many children, both sons and daughters. One of the sons, Aśoka, seems to have held successively the important

viceroyalties of Taxila and Ujjain. Tradition avers that when the emperor fell sick Aśoka left the government of Ujjain and came to Pāṭaliputra, the imperial capital. When his father died, he seized the sovereignty of the city, and put his eldest brother to death. He is said to have slain ninety-nine brothers born of different mothers. In the fifth Rock Edict, however, which was issued not earlier than the fourteenth regnal year, Aśoka refers to the harems of his brothers which were objects of his anxious care. This has been taken to indicate that the story of the slaughter of the brothers is a silly fiction, but we have to remember that the formal consecration of Aśoka was very probably delayed. This suggests a disputed succession. The fifth Rock Edict undoubtedly proves the existence of harems of brothers thirteen years after Aśoka's anointment, but it does not prove that the brothers themselves *without any exception* were all alive at that date. The traditional account may not be correct in all particulars, and the number of brothers killed may have been exaggerated, but that there was a fight for the crown, in the course of which the eldest brother perished, does not appear to be altogether improbable.

Aśoka

The reign of Bindusāra probably terminated in, or within a few years of, 273 B.C. Some time after—four years later according to tradition—his successor was solemnly enthroned at Pāṭaliputra and died after a reign of thirty-six or thirty-seven years, in or about 232 B.C. The name of the new king, as known from literature, and certain later epigraphs, was Aśoka. He is, however, generally mentioned in his inscriptions as Devānaṁpiya Piyadasi. Devānaṁpiya, "beloved of the gods", is a title which he shared with some of his predecessors, successors and contemporaries. The other appellation Piyadasi (Priyadarśin) or Piyadassana (Priyadarśana), "of amiable appearance", is said to have been borne also by his grandfather Chandragupta.

We know very little about the early years of Aśoka's reign. He must have continued the aggressive policy of his forebears. Literary tradition credits him with the suppression of a fresh revolt in Taxila, and a contemporary inscription records that when he had been anointed eight years the Kaliṅgas were conquered by him. The conquest of this province rounded off the Maurya empire, which now embraced almost the whole of non Tamil India and a considerable portion of Afghānistān. It stretched from the land of the Yonas, Kambojas and Gandhāras in

the Kābul valley and some adjoining mountain territory, to the country of the Andhras in the Godāvarī-Kṛishṇā basin and the district (Āhāra) of Isila in the north of Mysore, and from Sopārā and Girnār in the west to Dhauli and Jaugaḍa in the east. In the north-west, the empire touched the realm of Antiochos II, the Greek king of Syria and Western Asia, and in the south it extended as far as the kingdom of the Choḍas, Pāṇḍyas, Satiyaputra and Keralaputra in the Tamil country. If tradition is to be believed, the dominions of Aśoka included the secluded vales of Kāshmīr and Nepāl as well as the riparian plains of Puṇḍravardhana (North Bengal) and Samataṭa (East Bengal). The inclusion of the Himālayan valleys is rendered probable by the discovery of inscriptions at Mansehra in the Hazāra district, at Kālsi in the Dehra Dun district, at Nigāli Sāgar and Rummindeī in the Nepalese Tarai and at Rampurva in the Champaran district of North Bihār. But no recension of the Aśokan edicts has yet been found in Bengal, though an old Brāhmī inscription of Mahāsthān in North Bengal, which refers to the prosperous city of Puṇḍra-nagara, apparently belongs to the Pre-Christian Age.

The Kaliṅga war proved a turning-point in the career of Aśoka and produced results of far-reaching consequence in the history of India and of the whole eastern world. The sight of misery and bloodshed in the Kaliṅga campaign smote the emperor's conscience and awakened in his breast sincere feelings of repentance and sorrow. It made Aśoka intensely devoted to the practice of *Dharma* (morality and piety), the love of *Dharma* and the instruction of the people in *Dharma*. It also led to a momentous change in foreign policy. The emperor eschewed military conquest involving slaughter and deportation of people and evolved a policy of *dharma-vijaya*, "conquest by piety", in place of the old conquest by bows and arrows.

Aśoka had doubtless inherited the traditional devotion of Hindu kings to gods (*devas*) and the Brāhmaṇas, and, if the Kāshmīr chronicle of Kalhaṇa is to be believed, his favourite deity was Śiva. Shortly after the Kaliṅga war he seems to have been greatly influenced by Buddhist teaching. He became a lay worshipper (*upāsaka*) of the Buddha, but for some time did not show much zeal for the new faith. He then went out to *Sambodhi*, taken by some to refer to Bodh-Gayā, and also established intimate relations with the Buddhist *Saṅgha* or order of monks. According to one view, he actually entered the *Saṅgha* and became a monk. Contact with the place of enlightenment of the Blessed One, and the pious fraternity that he had founded, apparently galvanised Aśoka into greater exertions for the cause of religion and morality.

His new-born zeal showed itself in many ways. He made a deep study of the Buddhist scriptures and undertook "tours of morality" (*dharma-yātrā*) in the place of the pleasure tours (*vihāra-yātrā*) of his ancestors. In the course of these tours he visited the people of the country, instructing them in *Dharma* (morality and piety) and questioning them about *Dharma*. The royal preacher was highly pleased with the result of his tour. The sovereign was no longer to be seen only among litigants, priests, soldiers, and hunters of big game. The "Beloved of the Gods" had been among the country folk lecturing on *Dharma*. He had taught them that attainment of heaven is not the monopoly of the great alone. Even a lowly person could attain heaven if he was zealous in following the ancient rule of morality. The royal tours were apparently decennial. One was undertaken when the king had been anointed ten years, and another when he had been consecrated twenty years. In course of the second tour, the emperor visited the birthplace of Śākya-muni and that of a previous Buddha, and worshipped at these holy spots.

The dominions of Aśoka were vast, and the royal preacher must have soon realised that with all his zeal it would not be possible for him alone to bring the message of *Dharma* to the doors of all his subjects in the remotest corners of his far-flung empire. When he had been anointed twelve years, that is to say within two years of his first tour, he requisitioned the services of important officials like the *Rajukas* (probably district judges and survey officers), *Prādeśikas* (apparently officers in provinces charged with revenue collection and police) and *Yuktas* (clerks or secretaries). He ordered his officers to publish rescripts on morality and set out on tours every five years to give instruction in morality as well as for ordinary business. The rescripts and proclamations were to be engraved on rocks and on existing stone pillars. New "pillars of morality" (*dharma-stambha*) were also to be set up. These orders must have taxed the capacity of the officials to the utmost, and within a year the emperor felt the need of special functionaries whose sole business would be the promotion of religion. Accordingly, new officials, styled *Dharma-Mahāmātras* or high officers in charge of religion, were appointed. They were employed in the imperial capital as well as in the outlying towns and tribal territories, especially on the western and north-western border of the empire. They busied themselves with the affairs of all sects and of the people in various walks of life, including princes and princesses of the blood as well as prisoners in jail, ordinary householders and their servants as well as homeless ascetics. Reporters were posted

everywhere to keep the king informed of the doings of his officials and subjects. The moral uplift and the welfare of the country folk were specially entrusted to functionaries styled *Rajukas* who had imperial agents to guide them. Envoys went out to foreign courts so that people outside the empire might conform to morality.

The old policy of chastisement of turbulent forest tribes and troublesome neighbours, and conquest by force of arms, was given up, and a new policy of peace and forbearance, of "conquest by morality", was evolved. "The reverberation of the war-drum" (*bheri ghosha*) was to become "the reverberation of the law" (*dhamma ghosha*). Not content with what he did himself, the emperor called upon his sons and other descendants not to think of fresh conquest, but to take pleasure in mercy and light punishment, and regard the "conquest by morality" as the only true conquest. Here we have a complete reversal of the old policy pursued by the rulers of Magadha since the days of Bimbisāra. Aśoka said that his policy of *dharma-vijaya* met with phenomenal success, and he claimed to have made a spiritual conquest of the realms of his Hellenistic, Tamil and Ceylonese neighbours. His Hellenistic contemporaries were Antiochos (II, Theos of Syria, 261–246 B.C.), Ptolemy (II, Philadelphos of Egypt, 285–247 B.C.), Antigonos (Gonatas of Macedonia, 276–239 B.C.), Magas (of Cyrene, *c.* 300–258 B.C.) and Alexander (of Epirus, 272–*c.* 255 B.C., or, as some say, of Corinth, 252–*c.* 244 B.C.). The Maurya emperor, it is true, established philanthropic institutions in the realms of some of these princes, and Buddhism doubtless made some progress in western Asia and influenced later sects like the Manichaeans. But the Greeks apparently were not much impressed by lessons on non-violence. When the strong arm of Aśoka, "who possessed the power to punish in spite of his repentance", was withdrawn, the Greeks poured once more into the Kābul valley, the Punjab and even the Gangetic region and threw all these provinces into confusion.

The southern missions were more successful. If tradition is to be believed, the Ceylonese mission was headed by Prince Mahendra, a son or brother of Aśoka. Devānaṁpiya Tissa, the ruler of the island kingdom, was converted and his example was followed by his subjects. Ceylonese tradition avers that missionaries were sent even to Suvarṇa-bhūmi, i.e. Lower Burma, Sumatra and possibly some adjoining lands.

Aśoka's Dharma

In one of his inscriptions, Aśoka made an open confession of his faith in the Buddha, the *Dharma* (the Buddhist doctrine) and the *Saṅgha* (the Buddhist order of monks). He called the Buddha *Bhagavat*—an epithet applied by a Hindu to the object of his loving devotion. He went on pilgrimage to the places of the Blessed One's nativity and enlightenment and worshipped at the former place. He declared that whatever had been spoken by the Buddha, all that was quite well spoken. He took much interest in the exposition of the Buddhist *Dharma* or doctrine so that it might long endure. As to the *Saṅgha*, he kept in close touch with it after his memorable visit to the fraternity a year or so after his conversion. He impressed on the clergy the need of a correct exposition of the true doctrine and appointed special officers to busy themselves with the affairs of the Brotherhood. He also took steps to maintain the integrity of the church and prevent schism within its fold. Attempts in this direction are also recorded by tradition which avers further that a council was convened during his reign to compile the scriptures. That Aśoka interested himself in Buddhist scriptures as well as monastic discipline is amply attested by contemporary records.

But with all his faith in Buddhism, Aśoka was not intolerant of other creeds. He sought, it is true, to put an end to practices and institutions that he considered to be opposed to the fundamental principles of morality which, according to him, constituted the "essence of all religions". But he never became an enemy of the *Devas* and the Brāhmaṇas, or of any other religious fraternity. He continued to style himself the "Beloved of the *Devas*". He condemned unseemly behaviour towards Brāhmaṇas and showered gifts on them as well as on the Ājīvikas, the followers of Gosāla. His *Dharma-Mahāmātras* were told to look after all sects including even the *Nirgranthas* or the Jainas. The emperor laid special emphasis on concourse (*samavāya*) and the guarding of speech (*vachoguti*), and warned people against the evil consequences of using harsh language in respect of other sects.

Though himself convinced of the truth of Buddha's teaching, of the efficacy of worship at the Buddhist holy places, of the necessity of making a confession of faith in the Buddhist trinity, of keeping in close touch with the Buddhist *Saṅgha* and maintaining its solidarity, Aśoka never sought to impose his sectarian belief on others. The prospect that he held before the people at large is not that of *sambodhi* or *nirvāṇa* but of *svarga* (heaven)

and of mingling with the *Devas*. *Svarga* could be attained by all people, high or low, if only they showed zeal, not in adherence to a sectarian dogma or the performance of popular ritual (*maṅgala*) but in following the ancient rule (*porāṇā pakiti*), namely:

> "Obedience must be rendered to mother and father, likewise to elders; firmness (of compassion) must be shown towards animals; truth must be spoken: these same moral virtues must be practised.
>
> "In the same way the pupil must show reverence to the master, and one must behave in a suitable manner towards relatives."

In the pillar edicts it is declared that "happiness in this world and in the other world is difficult to secure without great love of morality, careful examination, great obedience, and great fear of sin and great energy". Prominence is also given, in the pillar edicts, to "spiritual insight". Towards the end of his career, Aśoka seems to have been convinced that reflection and meditation were of greater efficacy than moral regulations. But the need of such regulations was keenly felt by him in the first part of his reign.

It was a characteristic of Aśoka that he practised what he preached. He inculcated the virtues of compassion, liberality and toleration. He showed his compassion by abolishing or restricting the slaughter and mutilation of animals, and making arrangements for the healing both of men and beasts. He put a stop to the massacre of living creatures to make curries in the imperial kitchen, and discontinued the royal hunt. He abolished the sacrificial slaughter of animals and regulated festive gatherings (*samāja*) so as to prevent loss of life or the practice of immorality. He provided medical herbs both for men and lower animals. His officers constructed reservoirs of water and planted trees and groves for the comfort of travellers. Special officials were sent from headquarters to check oppression in the outlying provinces. Liberality and toleration were shown by undertaking pious tours for the distribution of gifts of gold to Brāhmaṇas as well as *śramaṇas*, by making gifts of cave-dwellings even to non-Buddhist sects, and by the creation of special officers for the distribution of alms to all sects. Queens and princes were encouraged to participate in these works of charity, and at least one of the queens, Kāruvāki, readily co-operated with her consort.

The reference to cave-dwellings affords us a glimpse into another side of the emperor's activity. As late as the fifth century A.D.

sojourners in Pāṭaliputra were struck with wonder at the magnificence of Aśoka's architectural achievements. Tradition credits him with the construction of a splendid palace besides numerous relic mounds, monasteries and temples. He is actually known to have enlarged the *stūpa* of Konākamana, a "former Buddha" and predecessor of Śākya-muni. He also set up pillars of morality (*dharma-stambha*). Modern critics are eloquent in their praise of the polished surface of his columns and the fine workmanship of their crowning sculptures, one of which, the capital of the Sarnath Pillar, has been adopted as the national emblem of Free India.

Aśoka's Character

Aśoka is one of the most remarkable personalities in the history of India. He was tireless in his exertions, and unflagging in his zeal—all directed to the promotion of the spiritual and moral welfare of his people whom he called his children. Of his energy, ability and power of organisation, there is no doubt. He was the statesman who conducted successfully a great military campaign that led to the destruction of a powerful adversary whose sway extended over a vast and populous realm. He organised, a few years later, missions for the spiritual conquest of three continents, and turned a local sect in the Ganges valley into a world religion. He preached and practised the virtues of concord, toleration and non-violence. He eschewed military conquest, not after defeat but after victory, and pursued a policy of gentleness and clemency while still possessed of the vast resources of a mighty empire. The generosity and forbearance of this strong man were only matched by his sincerity and veracity, and he describes in words at once truthful and straightforward the terrible misery that he had inflicted on the people of a hapless kingdom. The example of the pious Maurya king exercised an ennobling influence on succeeding generations. But the ruler who turned officers of state into religious propagandists, abolished the royal hunt and jousts of arms, entrusted the fierce tribesmen of the north-western and southern provinces to the tender care of preachers of morality, and did not rest till the sound of the war-drum was completely hushed and the only sound that was heard was that of religious discourses, certainly pursued a policy at which the great empire-builders who came before him would have looked askance. And it is not surprising that within a few years of his death the power that had hurled back the battalions of Seleukos proved unequal to the task of protecting the country from the princelings of Bactria.

The Later Imperial Mauryas

If Purāṇic tradition is to be believed, the immediate successor of Aśoka was his son Kunāla. The Chronicles of Kāshmīr, however, do not name this prince and mention Jalauka as the son and successor of Aśoka in that valley. It is not improbable that the Maurya empire broke up after the death of Aśoka, and was divided among his sons, one of whom inherited the home provinces and another made himself independent in the north-west. Tīvara, the only son named in the inscriptions, does not appear to have got a share of the patrimony. Kunāla was succeeded by his sons, one of whom, Bandhupālita, is known only in the Purāṇas, and another, Sampadi or Samprati, is mentioned by all our traditional authorities—Brāhmaṇical, Buddhist as well as Jaina, and is represented by the last as a ruler of Pāṭaliputra and Ujjain and a great patron of their faith. The Purāṇas, however, with the exception perhaps of the *Bhāgavata*, do not actually represent Samprati as a son of Kunāla, and interpose between him and Kunāla a number of princes amongst whom Daśaratha was certainly a historical figure. He ruled in Magadha shortly after Aśoka and has left three epigraphs in the Nāgārjuni Hills, Bihār recording the gifts of caves to the "venerable Ājīvikas".

After Daśaratha and Samprati came Śāliśūka, a prince mentioned in the astronomical work, the *Gārgī Saṁhitā*, as a wicked quarrelsome king. "Unrighteous, although theorising on righteousness, he cruelly oppressed his country." The successors of Śāliśūka, according to the Purāṇas, were Devavarman, Satamdhanus and Bṛihadratha. The last prince was overthrown by his commander-in-chief, Pushyamitra, who laid the foundations of a new dynasty styled Śuṅga in the Purānas. There were altogether 10 (according to some accounts, 9) kings in the Maurya dynasty who ruled for 137 years (324 to 187 B.C.).

There can be no doubt that during the rule of the later Mauryas the empire suffered a gradual decay. The secession of Kāshmīr and possibly of Berar is hinted at by Kalhaṇa, the historian of Kāshmīr, and Kālidāsa, the author of the Sanskrit play, the *Mālavikāgnimitram*, respectively. Towards the close of the third century B.C. the Kābul valley was under a king named Subhāgasena whose title, "king of the Indians", suggests that his territory included the Indus valley as well. As his name does not occur in any list of the later Mauryas, he may have belonged to a different family which rose to power in the north-west on the ruins of the Maurya empire. Even if he was connected with the

Maurya line, he could not have belonged to the main branch of the family ruling at Pātaliputra. The title given to him by the Greek historians indicates that he was an independent potentate and not a mere viceroy of Taxila. The disintegration of the empire invited invasions from without, and we are told by Polybius that Antiochos III, the Great (223–187 B.C.), grandson of Antiochos II Theos, the contemporary of Aśoka, and great-great-grandson of Seleukos I Nikator, the contemporary of Chandragupta Maurya, descended into India and received a number of elephants from Subhāgasena. If the *Gārgī Saṁhitā* is to be believed, a Greek army penetrated even to Pāṭaliputra.

The decline of Maurya authority is attributed by some scholars to a reaction promoted by the Brāhmaṇas whose privileged position is said to have been affected by the policy of Aśoka. But there is nothing in the records of Aśoka himself to suggest that he was an enemy of the Brāhmaṇas. On the contrary, he showed extreme solicitude for their welfare and extended his patronage to members of this community as well as to Buddhists, Jainas and Ājīvikas. One Brāhmaṇa historian, Kalhaṇa, praises him for his piety and benefactions and testifies to the friendly relations subsisting between one of his sons and the Brāhmaṇical Hindus. Another Brāhmaṇa writer, Bāṇa, applies the epithet *anārya*, ignoble, to the general who overthrew Bṛihadratha, the last of the Imperial Mauryas. Certain Purāṇic writers, it is true, refer to the Mauryas as *asuras* or demons, and the *Gārgī Saṁhitā* draws pointed attention to the oppressive rule of Śāliśūka, but there is nothing to suggest that the Brāhmaṇas were the special victims of Maurya oppression, and a Brāhmaṇa appears as the commander-in-chief under the last Maurya. The epithet *asura*, demon, or *suradvish*, enemy of the gods, was applied not only to the Mauryas but to all persons "beguiled by the Buddha". But the evidence of the Purāṇas in this respect is contradicted by that of contemporary inscriptions which refer to Aśoka and the only one among his successors who has left any epigraphic record as "*devānaṁpiya*", that is, "beloved (and not enemy) of the gods".

The true cause of the Maurya debacle perhaps lies deeper. Aśoka eschewed military conquest after the Kaliṅga war when he had been anointed eight years, and called upon his descendants not to entertain any thought of aggressive warfare. Shortly afterwards, even the royal hunt was abolished. The army seems to have been mostly inactive during the remaining part of the reign—a period of twenty-nine years—as the emperor himself exultingly declares that "in consequence of the practice of morality on his

part, the sound of *bheri*, or the war-drum, had become the sound of morality". The ease with which the general Pushyamitra, according to the testimony of Bāṇa, overthrew his king in the very sight of the troops shows that, unlike the earlier kings of the dynasty who often took the field in person, the last of the Mauryas lost touch with his armed forces and ceased to command their affection. Great difficulty was also experienced in controlling the officials in the outlying provinces even in the days of Bindusāra and Aśoka. If tradition is to be believed, ministerial oppression had twice goaded the people of Taxila to open rebellion. The quinquennial and triennial *anusaṁyāna* or tour of *mahāmātras* (high officers) was specially instituted by Aśoka to check this evil. But when his strong arm was withdrawn, central control apparently became slack. Some of the outlying provinces seceded from the empire, and the process of disintegration was accelerated by members of the imperial family, some of whom set up independent sovereignties while others cruelly oppressed the country. The distracted condition of the country emboldened the Greeks to renew their incursions. The final *coup de grâce* was given by the general Pushyamitra.

A Jaina tradition fixes the date of Chandragupta's accession at 313 B.C. It is, however, difficult to reconcile this tradition with the statement of the Buddhist chroniclers of Ceylon and Burma that the coronation of Aśoka took place 24+27 (or 28)+4=55 or 56 years after the accession of Chandragupta. The Purāṇas agree with the Buddhist chronicles in assigning a period of 24 years to Chandragupta. They give a smaller figure, 25, instead of the 28 of the Buddhist chroniclers of Ceylon and the 27 of the chroniclers of Burma, for the reign of Bindusāra and ignore the interval between the accession and coronation of Aśoka. But, as pointed out by Smith, they assign 137 years to the Maurya dynasty. The total of the lengths of reigns, according to the *Vāyu Purāṇa*, is, however, only 133. The difference of four years may be accounted for by the period of interregnum before the formal coronation of Aśoka. That emperor, in the thirteenth Rock Edict, mentions certain Yavana (Hellenic) kings as being alive. This must have been written after the twelfth year from his coronation, when he caused rescripts of morality to be written apparently for the first time. Among these Yavana kings there is no reference to Diodotos I of Bactria, who rose to power in the middle of the third century B.C. Magas of Cyrene, one of the kings named by Aśoka, died, according to the best authorities, not later than 258 B.C. His successor, Demetrios the Fair, is said to have met his death in

that year. If 258 B.C. is the latest possible date for the thirteenth Rock Edict, the coronation of Aśoka must have taken place certainly not later than 269 B.C. The accession of Chandragupta must have taken place, according to Buddhist evidence, not later than 269+55=324 B.C. and, according to the Purāṇic statements, not later than 269+25+24=318 B.C., or, including the period of interregnum before Aśoka, not later than 322 B.C.

In the account of the rise of Chandragupta given by Justin, we are expressly told that the young Indian leader was stimulated to aspire to kingship by an incident that happened immediately after his flight from the camp of Alexander in 326 B.C. The use of the term *deinde* ("thereafter", "some time after") in connection with the war against the prefects of Alexander suggests that the acquiescence of Indians in a change of government and the establishment of a new sovereignty is quite distinct from the war with the Macedonian prefects. There was an interval between the two events, and the Macedonian war came some time after the change of government among Indians.

In the Sanskrit play, the *Mudrārākshasa*, too, the destruction of the *Mlechchha* (barbarian) chieftains and troops follows the dynastic revolution in the interior of India. In 321 B.C. the Macedonian governor of Sind had already been forced to retire beyond the Indus, and no new satrap had been appointed in his place. The successors of Alexander in 321 B.C. confessed their inability to remove the Indian Rājās without royal troops under the command of some distinguished general. The abandonment of Sind, the complaint about the inadequacy of troops, and the wholesome respect for the power of the Indian Rājās, must have been due to new developments in politics. Greek military power to the east of the Indus was virtually extinguished as early as 321 B.C. The result could not have been due to Āmbhi, the Paurava, or any petty Rājā who had once acknowledged the Macedonian sway. Had they been instrumental in freeing their country from the foreign yoke, they and not Chandragupta and his band of mercenaries would have been mentioned by Justin as the great liberators. Moreover, if the destruction or expulsion of Greek commanders had already been effected by Āmbhi or the Paurava, then whence had come the prefects against whom Chandragupta went to war and fought so vigorously, as narrated by Justin? It is true that Chandragupta is not mentioned in connection with the partition treaties of Babylon and Triparadeisos. But we have a similar reticence in regard to Eudemos, the Yavana commandant in the Western Punjab who stuck to his post up to about 317 B.C.

The presence of this officer and that of his Indian colleagues does not preclude the possibility of the assumption of sovereignty by Chandragupta in the lower Indus valley or the plains and uplands of the Indian interior some time before 321 B.C.

Tradition avers that in overthrowing the iniquitous rule of the last Nanda, Chandragupta was greatly helped by the Brāhmaṇa Kauṭilya or Chānakya who became his chief minister. A direct attack on the heart of the Nanda empire is said to have failed. Next time the young Maurya is said to have commenced from the frontiers and met with success. The Nanda troops, led by the general Bhadrasāla, were defeated with great slaughter, and Chandragupta seized the sovereignty of Pātaliputra.

CHAPTER VIII

THE DISRUPTION OF THE MAGADHAN EMPIRE AND INCURSIONS FROM CENTRAL ASIA AND IRĀN

Successors of the Imperial Mauryas

With the fall of the Mauryas, Indian history for the time being loses its unity. The command of one single political authority is no longer obeyed over a large part of India. Hordes of foreign barbarians pour through the north-western gates of the country and establish powerful kingdoms in Gandhāra (North-West Frontier), Śākala (North-Central Punjab) and other places. The southern provinces throw off the yoke of Magadha and rival in power and splendour the remnant of the great empire of the Gangetic plain. A new dynasty supplants the Mauryas in the *Madhya-deśa*, or the Upper Ganges valley, and finds it no easy task to maintain its position against the rush of invasion from the south and the north-west.

In Magadha and the neighbouring provinces the immediate successors of the Mauryas, according to the Purāṇas, were the Śuṅgas who are usually regarded as a Brāhmaṇa family belonging to the *Bhāradvāja* clan. The founder, Pushyamitra, is known from literature and also from an epigraph, discovered at Ayodhyā. In one famous work, the family to which he belonged is styled *Baimbika* and not Śuṅga. He was the general of the last of the Imperial Mauryas, whom he overthrew in the very sight of the army. The people seem to have acquiesced in the change of dynasty as the later Mauryas had proved tyrannical and incapable of stemming the tide of Greek invasion and maintaining the prestige of the arms of Magadha.

The dominions of the new king at first extended as far south as the Narmadā (Narbadā or Nerbudda). The north-western boundary seems to have been ill-defined, but tradition credits the house of Pushyamitra with having exercised control as far as Jālandhar and Śiālkoṭ in the Punjab. Pāṭaliputra continued to be graced with the presence of the sovereign, but it had a rival in the city of Vidiśā, modern Besnagar in Eastern Mālwa, where the crown prince Agnimitra held his court.

The prince was soon involved in a war with the neighbouring kingdom of Vidarbha or Berar. He succeeded in defeating his adversary and reducing him to obedience. A more serious danger threatened from the north-west. The Greeks had renewed their incursions towards the close of the third century B.C. and a Greek king, Antiochos the Great of Syria, had penetrated into the Kābul valley and induced the Indian king Subhāgasena to surrender a number of elephants. His example was soon followed by his son-in-law Demetrios, prince of Bactria, who effected extensive conquests in the Punjab and the lower Indus valley. Equally brilliant achievements are attributed to a later king, Menander. The warlike activities of the Greeks are alluded to by Patañjali, Kālidāsa and the author of the *Gārgī Saṁhitā*. We are told that the "viciously valiant barbarians" besieged Sāketa in Oudh and Madhyamikā near Chitor and threatened Pāṭaliputra itself. The tide of invasion was arrested and prince Vasumitra, son of Agnimitra, inflicted a defeat on the *Yavanas* on the banks of the Sindhu, either the Indus or some stream in Central India. The grandfather of the victorious prince signalised the triumph of his arms by the successful performance of two horse-sacrifices. These rites had a double significance. On the one hand they proclaimed the rise of a new empire on the ashes of Mauryan hegemony, which was successful in defending *Āryāvarta* against the barbarian outcastes of the frontiers. On the other hand they heralded the dawn of a new Brāhmaṇical movement which reached its climax in the spacious days of the Guptas.

Pushyamitra died after a reign of thirty-six years, according to the Purāṇas (*c.* 187–151 B.C. according to the system of chronology adopted in these pages). He was succeeded by his son Agnimitra. This prince is the hero of a famous drama by India's greatest playwright, Kālidāsa. After him the history of the dynasty became obscure. Vidiśā, modern Besnagar in Eastern Mālwa, continued to be a great political centre, and its princes had diplomatic relations with the Greek potentates of the borderland. But the power of the family gradually weakened, and in the end the ruler of the line became a puppet in the hands of his Brāhmaṇa minister, like the Childerics and Chilperics of Western Europe in the hands of their Carolingian Mayors of the Palace. Eventually the ministerial family, known as Kāṇva, assumed the purple under Vasudeva (*c.* 75 B.C.), but permitted the *fainéant* kings of the Śuṅga dynasty to continue to rule in obscurity in a corner of their former dominions. In or about 40–30 B.C. both the Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas were swept away by a southern power, and the

province of Eastern Mālwa where stood the metropolis of Vidiśā was eventually absorbed within the dominions of the conqueror. Princes with names ending in Mitra, and possibly connected with the Śuṅgas and Kāṇvas, seem to have exercised sway in Magadha and the Ganges-Jumnā valley till the Scythian conquest.

The Sātavāhanas

The southern potentate who put an end to the rule of the Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas is described in the Purāṇas as an Andhra, a name applied to the people of the Telugu-speaking tract at the mouth of the Godāvarī and the Kṛishṇā. In contemporary epigraphic records, however, kings of this line are invariably referred to as Sātavāhana and a "district of the Sātavāhanas" has been proved to lie in the neighbourhood of Bellary in the Kanarese area of the Madras Presidency. The memory of the dynasty lingers in the story of the king Śālivāhana famous in Indian folk-lore. This legendary hero seems to have appropriated to himself the glorious deeds of several distinguished members of a long line of emperors of the Deccan.

The founder of the family was Simuka, but the man who raised it to eminence was his son or nephew Śātakarṇi I. The latter allied himself with the powerful Mahāraṭhi chieftains of the western Deccan, and signalised his accession to power by the performance of the horse-sacrifice. Some time after his death, the Sātavāhana power seems to have been submerged beneath a wave of Scythian invasion But the fortunes of the dynasty were restored by Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi, who took pride in calling himself the destroyer of the Sakas (Scythians), Yavanas (Greeks) and Pahlavas (Parthians). Gautamīputra built up an empire that extended from Mālwa in the north to the Kanarese country in the south. His son, Vāsishṭhīputra Pulumāyī, ruled at Pratishthāna or Paithan on the banks of the Godāvarī, now situated in the Aurangabad district of the Nizam's dominions. Two other cities, Vaijayantī (in North Kanara) and Amarāvatī (in the Guntur district), attained eminence in the Sātavāhana period. A king named Vāsishṭhīputra Śātakarṇi, who may have been a brother of Pulumāyī, married the daughter of the contemporary Śaka satrap (viceroy) Rudradāman I, but this did not prevent the latter from inflicting crushing defeats on his southern relation. The power of the Sātavāhanas revived under Sri Yajña Śātakarṇi, but he was the last great prince of the line, and after him the empire began to fall to pieces like the Bahmanī kingdom of a later age. According to some *Purāṇas* 19 kings of this

dynasty ruled for 300 years, while according to others, 30 kings ruled for 456 years. The dynasty came to an end about the middle of the third century A.D.

The most important among the succeeding powers in the Deccan were the Ābhīras and the Vākāṭakas of Nāsik and Berar in Upper Mahārāshtra, the Ikshvākus and the Śālaṅkāyanas of the Kṛishṇā and West Godāvarī districts, the Pallavas of Kāñchī (near Madras) and the Kadambas of Vaijayantī or Banavāsi in North Kanara.

Khāravela of Kaliṅga

The earlier Sātavāhana empire had a formidable rival in the kingdom of Kaliṅga, which had thrown off the yoke of Magadha some time after the death of Aśoka and risen to greatness under Khāravela, a prince of remarkable vigour and ambition. Khāravela defied or rescued Śātakarṇi, probably the first of that name, and humbled the pride of Magadha, then under a prince who has been identified with Bṛihaspatimitra. Bṛihaspati is, in the opinion of some scholars, the same as Pushyamitra, but the theory lacks plausibility. The Kaliṅga king is also credited with having pushed his southern conquests beyond the Godāvarī. His career was meteoric, and after his death his empire vanished as quickly as it had risen.

The Tamil Country

The far south of India beyond the Veṅkaṭa Hills, known as the Tamil or Draviḍa country, was parcelled out among many States of which three were important, namely, Choḷa, Pāṇḍya and Kerala. The Choḷas occupied the present Tanjore and Trichinopoly districts with some adjoining areas, and showed great military activity in the second century B.C. A Choḷa prince, Eḷara, conquered Ceylon, and many anecdotes have been preserved which testify to his strong sense of justice. The Pāṇḍyas excelled in trade and learning. They occupied the districts of Madurā and Tinnevelly with portions of South Travancore. A Pāṇḍya king sent an embassy to the Roman emperor, Augustus, in the first century B.C. To the north and west of the Pāṇḍyas lay the Kerala country embracing Mālabār, Cochin and North Travancore.

Renewed Incursions of the Greeks

The political disintegration of India after the Great Mauryas invited invasions from without, and we have already referred to

renewed warlike activities on the part of the Greeks of Syria and Bactria. The Syrian empire, once so powerful under Seleukos, was now seriously weakened by the secession of Parthia and Bactria which were torn from the Seleukidan dominions by satraps who revolted and asserted their independence. And it was from these rebellious provinces that fresh invaders swooped down upon the smiling plains of the Punjab.

At first Bactria showed the greatest activity. Demetrios, son of Euthydemos, king of Bactria, reduced to submission a considerable portion of Afghānistan, the Punjab and Sind, and founded or embellished cities in the conquered territories which bore his own name and possibly that of his father. But a rival appeared in Eukratides, who made himself master of the Indian borderland, leaving to his antagonist the precarious tenure of some provinces in the interior. A later king, Menander, who apparently belonged

COIN OF DEMETRIOS

to the house of Demetrios, reigned gloriously at Śākala (Euthymedia or Euthydemia), identified with modern Śiālkoṭ in the Punjab. His dominions may have included the Bajaur territory in the North-West where an inscription dated in the fifth year of his reign has been discovered. He is credited with having pushed his arms beyond the river Beas. Another king, Antialkidas, ruled at Taxila (near Rāwalpindi) in Gandhāra and sent an embassy to the court of Vidiśā. Some of these later Greek princes and members of their court succumbed to the influence of their environment and became adherents of Buddhism or of Vaishṇavism. Greek political power in parts of Afghānistān and the Indus valley was soon threatened by the Parthians led by Mithradates I, a contemporary of Eukratides who ruled in the second century B.C. In the first century A.D. all vestige of Greek rule seems to have disappeared from the Punjab as well as the borderland. The last known Greek king was Hermaios, who soon made way for the

ounders of the Parthian and Kushān monarchies to the south of the Hindukush.

The Sakas and Parthians

The foreign conquerors who supplanted the Greeks in north-west India belong to three main groups, namely, Śaka, Pahlava or Parthian, and Yue-chi or Kushān. The Śakas were displaced from their home in Central Asia by the Yue-chi and were forced to migrate south. We are told by Chinese annalists that the Śaka king went south and ruled in Ki-pin, which about this time probably corresponded to the territory drained by some of the northern tributaries of the Kābul river. They are found settled in southern Afghānistān in the time of Isidore of Charax, probably about the beginning of the Christian era, and the territory they occupied came to be known as Śakasthāna, modern Sistān. Gradually they extended their sway to the Indus valley and Western India, which came to be styled Scythia by Greek mariners and geographers in the first and second centuries A.D. In the first century after Christ part of this territory had already fallen into the hands of the Parthians. Inscriptions and coins disclose the names of many Scytho-Parthian kings and provincial governors. One of the earliest among these rulers was Maues, Moa or Moga, who was acknowledged as their suzerain by the governors of Chuksha near Taxila. Maues seems to have been followed by Azes I, Azilises and Azes II, after whom the sovereignty of the Indian borderland passed into the hands of Gondophernes, a Parthian. Some scholars attribute to Azes I the foundation of that reckoning commencing 58 B.C. which afterwards came to be known as the Vikrama *Samvat*, but the matter cannot be regarded as certain. Indian tradition ascribes to it an indigenous origin. It was handed down by the Mālava tribe, and in the post-Gupta period came to be associated with the great Vikramāditya, the destroyer of the Śakas.

With one of the kings named Azes was associated a ruler named Spalirises who seems to have reigned in Southern Afghānistān and to have been a successor of King Vonones. The identity of this Vonones with any king of the imperial line of Arsakes must remain a baffling problem. The Śaka-Pahlava kings ruled over an empire that embraced several provinces. The governors of these administrative units were known as satraps (*Kshatrapa*) or great satraps (*Mahākshatrapa*). One of these satrapal families ruled in Kāpiśa near the junction of the Ghorband and Panjshir rivers in Afghānistān,

another near Taxila in the Western Punjab, a third at Mathurā in the Jumnā valley, a fourth in the upper Deccan and a fifth at Ujjain in Mālwa. The satraps of the upper Deccan and part of Western India belonged to the Kshaharāta race, probably a branch of the Śakas. They carved out a principality on the ruins of the early Sātavāhana empire and attained great power under Nahapāna. But they were finally overthrown by Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi who restored the fallen fortunes of the Sātavāhana family. The satraps of Ujjain traced their descent from the lord (*svāmin*) Chashṭana, the Tiastanes of Ptolemy the geographer. Rudradāman, grandson of Chashṭana, ruled from about A.D. 130 to 150, and was one of the greatest Śaka rulers of ancient India. He entered into a matrimonial alliance with the Sātavāhana dynasty, but this did not prevent him from inflicting defeats on his southern neighbour. If his court poet is to be believed his sway extended from the Konkan in the south to Sind and Mārwār in the north. The successors of Rudradāman were not so strong as he was. Internal feuds were common. Power gradually fell into the hands of the Ābhīra chieftains. The death-knell of satrapal rule in Mālwa and Kāṭhiāwār was sounded when a new indigenous empire rose in the Ganges valley in the fourth century A.D. and the arms of Samudra Gupta and Chandra Gupta II swept through the tableland of Mālwa and involved Śaka and Ābhīra in common ruin.

Fall of the Parthians and the Kushān Conquest

Long before the final catastrophe that ultimately overtook the satrapal line of Chashṭana, the Śaka-Pahlava emperors of the north-west had passed through vicissitudes of another kind. Gondophernes, who had probably succeeded Azes II on the imperial throne of the north-west, had a chequered career. Numismatic evidence points to the wide extent of his sway and his leaning towards Indian culture. Tradition associates his name with that of the Christian apostle St. Thomas. He does not seem to have left to his successors a stable government. We are told by a contemporary Greek mariner that Parthian princes in the latter half of the first century A.D. were constantly driving each other out. The Yue-chi nomads of Central Asia, who had been driven from their ancestral abode on the Chinese frontier about 165 B.C. and had settled in the Oxus valley, were not slow to take advantage of Parthian disunion. The five principalities into which the Yue-chi were divided in their new home were consolidated into a powerful monarchy by Kieu-tsieu-k'io, identified with Kujula Kasa, Kadphises or

Kadphises I, head of the Kushān (*Kuṣana*) section of the horde. Kadphises attacked the Parthians, took possession of Ki-pin and Kābul and became complete master of the Indian borderland. Copper coins of Kujula bearing a remarkable resemblance to Roman *denarii*, particularly to the Constantia type of the emperor Claudius (A.D. 41–54), prove that he ruled not earlier than the middle of the first century A.D. A *terminus ad quem* is probably fixed by the Chinese reference to the Yue-chi occupation of Kābul or some territory in its neighbourhood before A.D. 92.

The successor of Kieu-tsieu-k'io or Kujula Kadphises was Yen-kao-chen or Vima Kadphises (II) of the coins. The new king is credited by Chinese annalists with the conquest of the Indian interior, where he set up a governor to rule in his name. He became a convert to Śaivism and proclaimed himself as *Mahiśvara* on his coins. The

KANISHKA
From a coin in the British Museum

wealth and prosperity of his dominions are illustrated by the fine gold coins that were issued under his orders. Ambassadors from India presented their credentials to the Roman emperor Trajan (A.D. 98–117). They may have arrived from the Kushān court, but it is uncertain whether they were sent by Kadphises II or a later king, Kanishka.

Kanishka I

Kanishka is usually regarded as a successor of Vima Kadphises (Kadphises II). To him is attributed by many scholars the foundation of the Śaka era of A.D. 78. This era is the only Indian reckoning traditionally ascribed to a Śaka potentate, and Kanishka is the only Scythian king known to have established an era, that is to say, his regnal reckoning was continued by his successors for several generations, and was thus transformed into an era. Kanishka was no doubt a Kushān and not strictly speaking a Śaka, but

the latter designation was used in India in a wide sense to include all kindred tribes. Chinese historians refer to a famous conflict between a Kushān king and the great general Pan-chao in the last quarter of the first century A.D. The view held by certain scholars is that the Kushān antagonist of Pan-chao was Kadphises II. No such event is, however, associated with Yen-kao-chen or Kadphises II by Chinese annalists. On the other hand Kanishka, whose name was not known to the official historians of China, certainly came into conflict with that country, and Hiuen Tsang speaks of one or more Chinese hostages detained at his court. If Kanishka was the contemporary of Pan-chao the ascription to him of the Śaka era cannot be regarded as untenable. But it is not possible to come to a definite conclusion on the origin of the era of A.D. 78.

According to Hiuen Tsang the great empire over which Kanishka exercised his sway had its capital at Purushapura or Peshāwār. Epigraphic evidence points to the inclusion within his dominions of the wide expanse of territory from Gandhāra and Sue Vihar to Oudh and Benares. The inclusion of Kāshmīr is testified to by Kalhaṇa, and clashes with the rulers of Sāketa and Pāṭaliputra are vouched for by other writers. As already stated, the pilgrim Hiuen Tsang refers to a war with China in the course of which the Kushān king obtained some initial successes in eastern Turkestān. But he was unable to make much impression on his mighty northern neighbour. The north alone, according to tradition, remained unsubdued.

But it is not as a conqueror that Kanishka is chiefly remembered by posterity. His chief title to fame rests on his monuments and on the patronage he extended to the religion of Śākya-muni. The celebrated *chaitya* that he constructed at Peshāwār excited the wonder and admiration of travellers down to a late period, and the famous sculptures executed under his orders include a life-size statue of the king himself. In Buddhist ecclesiastical history his name is honoured as that of the prince who summoned a great council to examine the Buddhist scriptures and prepare commentaries on them. Inscriptions and coins bear eloquent testimony to the king's zeal for the religion of the Buddha. That his association with it dated from the beginning of his reign is possibly proved by the Peshāwār Casket Inscriptions. Among the celebrities who graced his court the most eminent was perhaps Aśvaghosha, philosopher, poet, and dramatist, who wrote the *Buddha Charita* and other books.

Successors of Kanishka I

Kanishka's rule lasted for twenty-three years. His immediate successor was Vāsishka, who had a short reign and was succeeded by Huvishka. The empire of Huvishka was not less extensive than that of the traditional patron of Aśvaghosha. It may have spread farther to the west, as a record of his reign has been unearthed at Wardak to the west of Kābul. Mathurā was now a great centre of Kushān power and it was adorned with monuments by Huvishka as the city of Peshāwār had been embellished by Kanishka. For some time Huvishka had apparently a colleague or rival in Kanishka of the Ārā inscription, who is described as a son of Vājheshka, possibly the same as Vāsishka, and receives in addition to the titles of great king, the king of kings, son of heaven (*devaputra*) assumed by his predecessors, the novel title of Kaisara, "Caesar". In Kalhaṇa's Chronicle we have a reference to the rule of "Hushka, Jushka and Kanishka", apparently identical with Huvishka, Vājheshka and his son. They were the reputed founders of three cities in Kāshmīr named after them. Kanishka of this passage may have reference to the predecessor of Vāsishka, but it is more probable that the king referred to by Kalhaṇa is identical with his namesake mentioned in the Ārā inscription.

The last great Kushān king was Vāsudeva I, who ruled from about the year 67 to 98 of the Kanishka era. Most of his inscriptions have been found at or near Mathurā, and his coins usually bear the god Śiva and rarely any Iranian deity. It is not improbable that he gradually lost touch with the north-western provinces. The decline of the Kushān power in the north-west was hastened by the rise of the Sassanian dynasty of Persia. In the third century A.D. we find references to four separate kingdoms all dependent on the Yue-chi. This possibly suggests territorial disintegration though the nominal suzerainty of the "Son of Heaven" may have continued to be acknowledged by all these states. The rule of the Kushāns in part of the Jumnā valley seems to have been supplanted by that of the Nāgas. The latter are represented as ruling over Mathurā, Padmāvatī (Padam Pawaya) and a few other places in Mid-India contemporaneously with the Guptas of Prayāga (Allahābād), Sāketa (Oudh) and Magadha (South Bihār). About the middle of the fourth century A.D. the Nāgas were reduced to subjection by the Gupta emperors. The "Son of Heaven" continued to rule in diminished glory over an obscure corner of the Indian borderland where he soon felt the irresistible might of Gupta arms.

CHAPTER IX

CIVILISATION IN THE ERA OF MAURYAN IMPERIALISM AND OF GRAECO-SCYTHIAN INVASIONS (*c.* 324 B.C.—A.D. 320)

Forms of Government

In the period under review we have for the first time in the history of this country great empires extending from the Hindukush to the valleys of the Godāvarī and the Kṛishṇā. It will, however, be a mistake to think that the imperial or even the ordinary monarchical system was the only form of government known to the people of the age. Greek observers referring to the activities of the overseers who "enquire into and superintend all that goes on in India" add that "they make report to the king or, where the state is without a king, to the magistrates". Thus non-monarchical states governed by their own magistrates flourished side by side with territories ruled by kings. Arrian makes distinct mention of self-governed cities. Towards the end of our period the existence of autonomous tribal governments is proved by numismatic evidence. Such states are usually referred to as *gaṇas*, although the designation *saṅgha* is also known.

But monarchy was in this, as in all ages, in this country, the prevailing form of government. A remarkable feature of the period is the association in many parts of India of a prince of the blood or an allied chieftain with the titular or real head of the government as co-ordinate ruler or subordinate colleague. Such a prince was often called *yuvarāja* or *yuva-mahārāja* (crown prince or junior king). Sometimes he was honoured with full regal titles. In the literature on polity this type of rule was known as *dvairājya* or diarchy.

Ideas of Kingship

Ideas of kingship underwent a change during the period. At the commencement of the age a king was considered to be a mere mortal, though a favoured mortal, the beloved of the deities. Thus Aśoka referred to himself and his forebears as *devānaṁpiya*, the beloved of the gods. The Greeks, however, introduced titles like the "divine king", the 'god-like queen", etc. In the early centuries

of the Christian era a Parthian king took the title of Devavrata, an epithet applied to an epic hero, the son of a river goddess, and also to Kārttikeya, the god of war. The Kushān emperors adopted the still more significant title of *devaputra*, "Son of Heaven". The deification of rulers was clearly on the way to accomplishment, and ideas of divine kingship found favour especially in tracts which came under foreign influence. Greek and Chinese influence is clearly discernible in the title of *devaputra*.

Kings, even those who preceded the Scythian "Sons of Heaven", were no puppets. They had usually at their disposal powerful standing armies and the material resources of vast kingdoms and empires over which they presided. From the observations of Greek writers and the actual records of the reigns of Chandragupta, Aśoka, Khāravela, Gautamīputra and many other rulers, it is clear that kings often led the troops in person to the battlefield. They also administered justice, issued rescripts, made important appointments, granted remission of taxes and took a large share in the ordinary work of civil government. They generally held in their hands the main strings of policy. Rulers with such powers and resources cannot be regarded as limited monarchs of the type with which the modern world is familiar. Nevertheless it is a mistake to consider Hindu kings of the age as absolute despots. There was a body of ancient rules which even the most masterful of the rulers of the period viewed with respect. The people were an important element (*prakṛiti*) of the state. They were looked upon as children (*prajā*) for whose welfare the head of the state was responsible, and to whom he owed a debt which could only be discharged by good government. There was a certain amount of decentralisation notably in the spheres of local government, legislation and administration of justice in the rural areas. The existence of autonomous communities, urban and rural, political and economic, social and religious, put a limit, in normal times, on the exercise of authority by the supreme executive. Lastly, there was usually at imperial head-quarters, and also at the chief centres of provincial government, a body of ministers (*mantri parishad, mati sachiva*) who had a right to be consulted especially at times of emergency.

Literature on Polity

For a detailed record of the administrative arrangements of the period we have to look mainly to three classes of evidence, namely, inscriptions, accounts of Greek and Roman observers, notably Megasthenes, and literature on polity styled *Rājaśāstra* or *Arthaśāstra*.

Treatises on polity are often found embedded in legal or Purāṇic collections. But a few exist as independent works. The most famous among these is the *Arthaśāstra* attributed to Kauṭilya, the traditional minister of Chandragupta Maurya. The *Arthaśāstra* certainly existed before Bāṇa (seventh century A.D.) and the *Nandi Sūtra* of the Jainas (not later than the fifth century A.D.). But it is doubtful if in its present shape it is as old as the time of the first Maurya. Reference to *Chinapaṭṭa*, China silk, a commodity often mentioned in classical Sanskrit literature, points to a later date, as China was clearly outside the horizon of the early Mauryas, and is unknown to Indian epigraphy before the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions. Equally noteworthy is the use of Sanskrit as the official language, a feature not characteristic of the Maurya period. A date as late as the Gupta period is, however, precluded by the absence of any reference to the *denarius* in the sections dealing with weights and coins. Quite in keeping with this view is the reference to the *Arthaśāstra* contained in the Jaina canonical works that were reduced to writing in the Gupta age.

Maurya Administration

The administrative history of the epoch is best studied under two heads, namely, Maurya administration and the system prevailing in the days of their Indian and Graeco-Scythian successors.

As already stated, the Maurya king did not lay claim to divine rank. Aśoka looked upon his people as his children and assigned their care to his officers just as a mother does to skilful nurses. The idea of government paternalism persists in these expressions. In one record he declared that whatever effort he was making was intended to discharge the debt which he owed to living beings. The *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*, which in its present shape may be post-Mauryan but which uses older material, declares that "whatever pleases himself the king shall not consider as good, but whatever pleases his subjects he shall consider as good." The king is also advised to show fatherly kindness to his people

The powers of the king were extensive. We have it on the authority of Megasthenes that the king took part in war and the administration of justice. While listening to causes he did not suffer himself to be interrupted even though the time arrived for the massage of his limbs. Appointments to the most important offices were made by the ruler himself; he also often laid down the broad lines of policy and issued rescripts and codes of regulations (*śāsana*, *dharmaniyama*) for the guidance of his officers and the people.

Control was maintained over the most distant officials by an army of secret reporters and itinerant judges, and communication with them was kept up by a network of roads marked with pillars at every ten *stadia*.

It was impossible for a single individual to support the Atlantean load of administration. The king had the assistance of a council of advisers styled the *Parishad* or the *mantri parishad*, who were specially consulted in times of emergency. There were also bodies (*nikāya*) of trained officials who looked after the ordinary affairs of the realm. Greek writers refer to three important classes of officers, styled district officials (Agronomoi), city commissioners (Astynomoi) and a third body who had the care of military affairs. In the inscriptions of Aśoka we have references to *Rajukas* and *Prādeśikas*, charged with the welfare of *Jānapadas* or country parts and *Pradeśas* or districts, *Mahāmātras* or high officers charged with the administrations of cities (*Nagala Viyohālaka*) and sundry other matters, and a host of minor officials including clerks (*Yuta*), scribes (*Lipikara*) and reporters (*Paṭivedaka*). The *Arthaśāstra* mentions the official designations *Mahāmātra*, *Yukta*, etc. It refers to the highest officers as the eighteen *tīrthas*, the chief amongst whom were the *Mantrin* (chief minister), *Purohita* (high priest), *Yuvarāja* (heir-apparent) and *Senāpati* (commander-in-chief). Another important class of officials mentioned in the literature on polity are the *Adhyakshas* or superintendents in charge of the various departments of the state. Officials were appointed irrespective of caste, creed or nationality. *Vaiśyas* and even *Yavanas* were admitted to the highest offices of the state.

At the head of the judiciary stood the king himself. But there were special tribunals of justice, both in cities and the country parts, presided over by *Mahāmātras* and *Rajukas*. Greek writers refer to judges who listened to the cases of foreigners. Petty cases in villages were doubtless decided by the headman and the village elders. Aśoka seems to have introduced many reforms in judicial administration and procedure. While preserving a certain amount of uniformity he is said to have allowed considerable discretion to the *Rajukas* so that they could discharge their duties unperturbed. Greek writers testify to the severity of the penal code, and the emperor admits in some of his inscriptions that in Kaliṅga individuals suffered from arbitrary imprisonment and torture. To check maladministration in this and other outlying areas the emperor or his viceroys sent forth in rotation every five or three years such officers as were of mild and temperate disposition and regardful of the sanctity of life.

The army was often led by the king himself. Chandragupta personally undertook the campaign against the generals of Alexander, and Aśoka was an eye-witness of the terrible carnage in Kaliṅga. It is only in the days of the last Maurya that we find a *senāpati* overshadowing the king and transferring to himself the allegiance of the troops. The army of Chandragupta, according to Pliny, included 600,000 foot soldiers, 30,000 cavalry, and 9,000 elephants, besides chariots. The protection of the king's person was entrusted to an amazonian bodyguard of armed women. The fighting forces were under the supervision of a governing body of thirty divided into six boards of five members each. Each of these boards was responsible for one of the following departments, namely, the navy, transport and commissariat, the infantry, the cavalry, the chariots and the elephants. In military as well as judicial affairs Aśoka must have introduced great innovations. He deprecated wars and abolished even hunting. In one of his inscriptions he declares exultingly that throughout his dominions the sound of the war-drum had become the sound of *dharma* (religious discourse). It would have been a miracle if the army could have preserved its morale and efficiency under such circumstances.

The cost of civil and military administration even at the centre must have been enormous. The chief sources of revenue from villages mentioned in an inscription of Aśoka are the *bhāga* and the *bali*. The *bhāga* was the king's share of the produce of the soil, which was normally fixed at one-sixth, though in special cases it was raised to one-fourth or reduced to one-eighth. *Bali* is explained by commentators as an extra impost levied on special tracts for the subsistence of certain officials. According to Greek writers, husbandmen paid, in addition to a fourth part of the produce of the soil, a land tribute because "all India is the property of the Crown and no private person is permitted to own land". Originally *bali* may have had reference to this land tribute. Taxes on land were collected by the *Agronomoi* who measured the land and superintended the irrigation works. Other state-dues included cattle from herdsmen and tribute and prescribed services from those engaged in the trades. In urban areas the main sources of revenue were birth and death taxes, fines and tithes on sales. The distinction between taxes levied in rural and fortified areas (*rāshtra* and *durga*) is indicated in the *Arthaśāstra*, which refers to certain high revenue functionaries styled the *samāhartṛi* and the *sannidhātṛi*. No such officials are, however, mentioned in the known Maurya inscriptions. Greek writers on the other hand, in describing the

seventh caste of Indian society which consisted of the king's councillors and assessors refer distinctly to treasurers of the state or superintendents of the treasury.

A considerable part of the revenue was spent on the army. The artisans, too, according to Diodoros, received maintenance from the imperial exchequer. They made armour for the troops, and constructed implements for husbandmen and others. The services of some of them must have been requisitioned for the construction of the wooden ramparts and towers encircling the city of Pāṭaliputra, and the splendid palaces which excelled in magnificence the stately regal edifices of Susa and Ecbatana. To them we owe also the splendid monoliths and other monuments of the time of Aśoka.

Herdsmen and hunters received an allowance of grain from the state in return for clearing the land of wild beasts and fowls. Another class which benefited from the royal bounty were the philosophers, among whom were included *Brāhmaṇas* as well as *Śramaṇas* (ascetics). Vast sums were also spent for irrigation and other works of public utility. The most famous of the irrigation works of the early Maurya period is the Sudarśana lake of Kāṭhiāwār, constructed by Pushyagupta the Vaiśya, an officer of the founder of the dynasty, and provided with supplemental channels by the *Yavanarāja* Tushāspha in the days of the emperor Aśoka. Roads furnished with milestones had already been constructed by the officials of the first Maurya. These were provided with shady groves and wells by his famous grandson. The latter also built hospitals both for men and other living creatures.

For the efficient administration of their huge empire the Mauryas divided their dominions into provinces subdivided into districts called *āhāra*, *vishaya* and perhaps also *pradeśa*. Each of the provinces was placed under a viceroy or governor who was either a prince of the blood or an official of the crown. In one case, and perhaps in several others, the local ruler or administrator bore the title of *rājā*, which is normally indicative of feudatory rank. The system of hereditary officials does not seem to have come into use in the early period, at least in the province of Surāshṭra or Kāṭhiāwār. The assumption of the title of rājā by local rulers, and the grant of autonomy to the *Rajukas* in the days of Aśoka, ultimately let loose centrifugal forces which must have helped in the dismemberment of the empire. In the early Maurya period, however, efficient control over the provincial governors was maintained in various ways. With the princely viceroys were associated a number of high officers (*mahāmātras*) who received

orders from the sovereign. The work of erring *mahāmātras* in certain areas was supervised by special officers sent periodically from the metropolis. There was, besides, a host of secret emissaries of the central government (ephors, episkopoi, *paṭivedakas*) who enquired into and superintended all that went on in India and made reports to the emperor. Aśoka gave special directions to the reporters that they were to report to him the affairs of the people at any time anywhere "while he was eating, in the harem, in the inner apartment, at the cow-pen, in the palanquin or in the park".

It may be thought that the all-embracing activities of the Maurya imperial government left little room for popular initiative or self-government. Nevertheless it is a fact that autonomous communities did exist in Maurya India, and classical writers make distinct mention of self-governed cities. Important affairs of the metropolis itself were conducted by a commission of thirty members divided, like the governing body of the defence forces, into six boards of five members each. There was a small committee to look after each of the following departments, namely, the mechanical arts, foreign residents, registration of births and deaths, sales, exchanges, weights and measures, supervision of manufactured articles, and collection of tithes on sales. Officers in charge of the city (*nagarādhyaksha*, *nigamapradhāna*) find mention in Indian literature. The *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* says in the chapter dealing with the examination of government servants that each department shall be officered by several heads (*bahumukhya*), and that the *adhyaksha*, or chief executive officer of a department, shall carry on his work in company with four other officials. The *Nagaraka* or the Town Prefect, whose duties are described in a subsequent chapter, was a distinct official whose existence in the Maurya period is proved by the testimony of the Kaliṅga edicts of Aśoka.

Administration in the Post-Maurya Period

In the post-Maurya period ideas of kingship changed, but a ruler still considered it to be his duty to please his people. The official machinery of the Aśokan age continued to function at least in those parts of India which did not come under Greek and Scythian domination. The science of government (*arthavidyā*) was now regularly studied and its influence is seen in epigraphic references to the education of princes, insistence on prescribed qualifications for appointment to high offices, classification of ministers, measures taken to secure the welfare of citizens both in urban and rural areas, and abstention from oppressive imposition

of vexatious taxes like *Kara* (extra cess), *Vishṭi* (forced labour) and *Praṇaya* (benevolence) in addition to the customary *Bali* (tribute), *Sulka* (duty), and *Bhāga* (king's share of the produce).

Innovations in administration were, however, introduced in north-west India, the territory that was ruled by successive dynasties of foreign conquerors. One of the most important changes related to the system of provincial government. The system of government by hereditary officials with the Persian title of Satrap was introduced in Taxila, Mathurā, Ujjain and a few other places, and we have references even to functionaries with the Greek titles of *meridarch* and *strategos*. A body of counsellors (*mati sachiva*) seems to have been associated with some of the provincial rulers, but the rule of others was often of a purely military character. The influence of the system of military governors (*strategos*) is clearly seen in the appointment by Sātavāhana kings of district officers styled *mahāsenāpati*.

In spite of the prevalence of military rule in certain areas the old self-governing institutions did not wholly perish. Town councils (*nigama sabhā*) and officials styled *nagarākshadarśa* (city judges) are mentioned in several records and these correspond to the municipal commission and the *nagala viyohālaka* of the Maurya period. The affairs of the village continued to be controlled by the village functionaries led by the head-man. The village assembly afforded a field for co-operation between kings and villagers.

Social Conditions

Varṇa (caste) and *āśrama* (periods or stages of religious discipline), the two characteristic institutions of the Hindu social polity, reached a definite stage in the Maurya period. Greek writers inform us that no one was allowed to marry out of his own caste or to exercise any calling or art except his own. For instance, a soldier could not become a husbandman or an artisan a philosopher. It is, however, added by some that the sophists could be from any caste. Philosophers lived in simple style and devoted their lives to serious study and discourses. Some of them became wood-dwellers (hylobioi) who subsisted on leaves and fruits and wore garments made from the bark of trees. These undoubtedly correspond to the *vānaprastha* order of Hindu anchorites. In the inscriptions of Aśoka we have mention of householders and wandering ascetics. The system of the four *āśramas* was thus well established in the early Maurya age.

The rise of heterodox creeds, the influx of foreigners and many

other causes must have affected to a certain extent the rigidity of caste rules. Instances of matrimonial alliances between Indian monarchs and foreign potentates are known, and a Sātavāhana record makes pointed reference to the mingling of the four castes which a king took considerable pains to prevent. The same king is eulogised as a promoter of the households of Brāhmaṇas and the lowly orders, doubtless the *Vaiśyas* and the *Śūdras*. The *Kautilīya Arthaśāstra* mentions agriculture, cattle breeding and trade as the common occupation of *Vaiśyas* and *Śūdras*, and, if Greek writers are to be believed, the old distinction between the *Vaiśya* and *Śūdra* was gradually obliterated and replaced by a new distinction between husbandmen, herdsmen, and traders, who constituted distinct castes. The physicians too emerge as a distinct group of philosophers next in point of honour to the wood-dwellers. Another remarkable feature of the period is the growth of two official castes, namely, the overseers and the councillors. The latter doubtless correspond to the *amātya* (or *amacca*) *kula* of the Pāli texts. The philosophers, the husbandmen, the herdsmen and hunters, the traders and artisans, the soldiers, the overseers and the councillors constituted the seven castes into which the population of India was divided in the days of Megasthenes. There is no reason to doubt that the Greek writer described the actual conditions as witnessed by him as opposed to the theory of the law-books. The restoration of the fourfold division of caste (*chāturvarṇa*) was sought by the great Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi, who referred to *dvijas* (Brāhmaṇas) and *avaras* (the lower orders) as objects of his special care and to the Kshatriyas as a conceited class whom he did much to repress. The cause of Gautamīputra's hostility to the warrior caste is not clear. It is possible that the ranks of the latter were being swelled by *Yavanas*, *Śakas*, and *Pahlavas* who are classed by the author of the *Mānava-dharmaśāstra* (Institutes of Manu) as degraded Kshatriyas. It is well known that the wrath of the great Sātavāhana was specially directed against the latter. Caste rules could not, however, be rigidly enforced. The Sātavāhanas themselves intermarried with Śakas, and Brāhmaṇas figure as generals and kings like Droṇa of old.

Regarding the position of women, Greek writers and contemporary epigraphs give us a few details. We are told that some of them pursued philosophy and lived a life of continence. But married women were denied the privilege of sharing with their husbands a knowledge of the sacred lore. Polygamy was practised, especially by rulers and noblemen. The care of the king's person was entrusted to women, and we have the curious story that a woman who

killed a king when drunk was rewarded by becoming the wife of his successor. Aśoka refers to women as particularly given to the performance of many trivial and worthless ceremonies. The practice of seclusion of women is hinted at by expressions like *Olodhana* occurring in inscriptions. Superintendents to look after women are mentioned. That the wife took a prominent share in religious activities by the side of her husband is clear from the record of the benefactions of Kāruvāki, the second queen of Aśoka himself. A glimpse of the way in which the life of a pious widow was spent is afforded by a Nāsik record which refers to the queen-dowager Gautamī Balaśrī as one who delighted in truth, charity, patience, and respect for life; who was bent on penance, self-control, restraint and abstinence, fully working out the type of a royal sage's wife (*rājarishibadhu*). Her son is eulogised for unquestioning obedience towards his mother. "Women though deserving of honour should not have independence" says the law-giver. But history records instances of royal ladies who guided the affairs of a realm on behalf of their children.

Slavery was an established institution. It is recognised not only by the law-books and the literature on polity, but is expressly referred to in inscriptions. Aśoka draws a distinction between the slave and the hired labourer and inculcates kind treatment for all. Arrian, however, probably relying on Megasthenes, states that "all the Indians are free and not one of them is a slave". Strabo also quotes Megasthenes as saying that none of the Indians employed slaves. But the same writer in describing the customs of the court of Pāṭaliputra observes that the care of the king's person is entrusted to women who are bought from their parents. Buying and selling of women are thus admitted. We have it on the authority of Hegesander and Athenaios that Amitrochates, that is Bindusāra, wrote to Antiochos asking him to purchase and send him not only sweet wine and dried figs but a sophist, only to be reminded that it was not lawful in Greece to sell a sophist. The implication is that a different law prevailed in the realm of Bindusāra. It has been pointed out by some scholars that Megasthenes may have been misled by the statement of Onesikritos about the non-existence of slavery in the lower Indus valley, or he may have heard of the principle laid down in Indian works on polity that no Aryan should be kept in the condition of permanent slavery.

About the manners and customs of the Indians we are told by Greek and Latin writers that they lived frugally and observed good order. Cultivators were mild and gentle. Theft was a thing

of very rare occurrence and no Indian was accused of lying. The people never drank wine except at sacrifices and their food was principally a rice pottage. Their laws were simple. They had no suits about pledges or deposits nor did they require seals or witnesses, but they made their deposits and confided in each other. Their houses and property were generally left unguarded. We are further told that the Indians were a simple folk ignorant of writing and conducted all matters by memory. That the picture is a little overdrawn seems clear from what the same writers say about the different sections of the people in other passages. Thus Strabo tells us that fighting men when not engaged in active service passed their time in idleness and drinking. Speaking about a great synod that used to be held by philosophers, the same writer informs us that some of them commit their suggestions to writing. In another passage he quotes Nearchos as saying that Indians wrote letters on pieces of closely woven linen, while Curtius informs us that the bark of trees was used for writing on.

Games and Recreations

Inscriptions of the period refer frequently to *utsava* and *samāja*, festivities and merry gatherings. Kings considered it a duty to give practical demonstration of their sympathy with the people by liberality on such occasions. Dancing, singing and instrumental music must have formed an important part of all festivities. *Samājas* were often held in honour of a deity, e.g., Brahmā, Paśupati-Śiva, or Sarasvatī. A prominent feature of some of these assemblies was a joust of arms in which wrestlers from distant regions took part. Fights between men and between elephants and other animals are mentioned by Aelian, who also describes chariot races with teams of oxen and horses as practised in the imperial city of Pāṭaliputra. The combats of men and animals often led to shedding of blood, and this was perhaps the reason why Aśoka issued an edict forbidding certain types of *samāja* "in which he saw much offence", while admitting that there were other festal meetings which were excellent in his sight. Patañjali makes mention of dramatic representations by the *Śaubhikas* or *Śobhanikas* who gave before the eyes of the spectators an actual demonstration of the incidents mentioned in the plays. He also refers to *Granthikas* who related the fortunes of their subjects from birth to death. Dice play afforded pleasure to many though its baneful effects are frequently alluded to. Buddhist writers refer to games on boards with eight or ten rows of squares from which chess play

ultimately evolved. The Jaina *Sūtrakṛitāṅga* makes explicit mention of chess (*ashṭapada*), a game that must have become very popular by the time of Bāṇa's *Harsha-charita* and Ratnākara's *Haravijaya* (ninth century A.D.).

Condition of the Peasantry

The common people, as distinguished from the intellectual and official aristocracy, seem to have been divided into three main classes, namely, husbandmen, herdsmen and hunters, and traders and artisans. Husbandmen formed the most numerous class of the population. Their lot in the early Maurya period does not appear to have been hard. We are told by Greek observers that they were exempted from fighting and other public services, and devoted the whole of their time to tillage. Men of this class were regarded as public benefactors and were not molested in times of war and conflict. The land remaining unravaged produced heavy crops and supplied the inhabitants with all that was requisite to make life very enjoyable. Husbandmen lived in the country away from towns. They paid into the treasury a share of the produce of the soil besides a land tribute which may be identical with the *bali* of the epigraphs. In times of emergency they had to pay benevolences. But such imposts were levied on rare occasions and a Śaka ruler specially notes the fact that he carried out certain works without resorting to forced labour, extra cess or benevolences. In parts of India the lot of the rural population was probably a little harder. Some idea of the burden borne by the ordinary villagers in these tracts may be gathered from the immunities (*parihāra*) that were granted, according to certain records of the Sātavāhanas and their successors, to *Vāṭakas* and *Kshetras*, that is, gardens and fields, conferred on privileged individuals or communities by royal personages. Such plots were "not to be entered by royal officers, not to be touched by any of them, not to be dug for salt, not to be interfered with by the district police". A fuller list of various kinds of immunity is given in a Pallava record which says that a garden which belongs to the Brāhmaṇas is to be "free from *Kara* (extra cess), free from the taking of sweet and sour milk, free from troubles about salt and sugar, free from forced labour, free from the taking of the oxen in succession, free from the taking of grass and wood, free from the taking of vegetables and flowers".

The rural areas were exposed to danger from flood, fire and locusts. Philosophers are represented by classical writers as gathering together at the beginning of the year to forewarn the

assembled multitude about droughts and wet weather and also about propitious winds and about diseases. Storehouses were set up to provide for emergencies due to pests. The state was enjoined by the *Arthaśāstra* writers to show favour in times of distress by distributing seeds and food. We have it on the testimony of Greek writers that the sovereign always made adequate provision against a coming deficiency, and never failed to prepare beforehand what would help in time of need. The duty of clearing the country of all sorts of wild beasts and birds which devoured the seeds sown by husbandmen devolved on herdsmen and hunters who lived in tents or on the hills. By hunting and trapping they freed the country from pests. Implements for agriculturists were made by the artisans, who were not only exempted from taxation but received maintenance from the royal exchequer. In return for these concessions they had to render to the state certain prescribed services.

Trade and Navigation

Kings as well as independent cities depended to a large extent on the tribute paid by the peasantry, but a considerable portion of the state revenues came from traders. In records of the period *śulka* is mentioned as an important source of royal income along with *bali* and *bhāga*. Maurya India had direct relations with Syria, Egypt and other countries of the Hellenistic West. There was a considerable body of foreign residents in the metropolis whose affairs were looked after by a special board of municipal commissioners. These foreigners could not all have been diplomatists. Some of them were in all probability traders. As early as the first century B.C. contact was established between India and the Roman empire. In the early centuries of the Christian era we have epigraphic as well as literary references to intercourse with China, the Hellenic world, Ceylon and Farther India. These are recorded in the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions and the *Milindapañho*.

Classical writers bear testimony to the activity and daring of the Indian navigators. One writer narrates how, in the reign of Euergetes II (145–116 B.C.), an Indian was brought to the king by the coast guard of the Arabian Gulf. They reported that they had found him in a ship alone and half dead. He spoke a language which they could not understand. He was taught the Greek tongue and then he related how he had started from the coast of India but lost his course and reached Egypt alone. All his companions had perished from hunger. If he were restored to his country he would point out to those sent with him the route by

sea to India. Eudoxus of Cyzicus was one of the number thus sent. He brought back with him aromatics and precious stones. Another writer relates that a present was given by the king of the Suevi to a pro-consul in Gaul, consisting of some Indians who, sailing from India for the purpose of commerce, had been driven by storms into Germany.

Sweet wine and dried figs of the West were eagerly sought by a Maurya king in the third century B.C. In the first century A.D. presents for the king of Broach, which was one of the greatest marts in the east, included costly vessels of silver, singing boys, beautiful maidens for the harem, fine wines, thin clothing and the choicest ointments. The Westerners on their part imported articles of luxury including the fine muslin of the lower Gangetic region. Pliny bears testimony to the vast sums of money sent to India in payment for these commodities. As early as the fourth century B.C. the municipal authorities of Pāṭaliputra had to constitute a special board to superintend trade and commerce. Its members had charge of weights and measures and saw that products in their seasons were sold with an official stamp. In the first century A.D. trade between India and the West was greatly facilitated when the pilot Hippalus discovered how to lay his course straight across the ocean. The splendid river system of northern India rendered transport comparatively easy in this area. The Maurya government built ships and let them out on hire for the transport of merchandise. Communication was more difficult in the Deccan, where vast tracts were without roads and goods had to be carried with difficulty by wagons from Paithan and Tagara to the port of Broach.

Medium of Exchange

Foreign commerce brought a large quantity of specie to India, and we have already referred to Pliny's complaint about the drainage of Roman coins to this country. In the opinion of scholars the institution of a gold coinage by the Kushān imperial government from the time of Kadphises II is due to the influx of gold from the Roman empire. The Indians had an indigenous silver and copper coinage even in the pre-Maurya period. The gold *nishka*, though often used as a medium of exchange, probably did not in the early period possess all the characteristics of a regular coinage. The silver coin of thirty-two *ratis* (58.56 grs.) was known to the writer of the *Mānava-dharmaśāstra* (Institutes of Manu) as *Purāṇa* or *Dharaṇa*. The copper coin of eighty *ratis*

(146.4 grs.) was known as *Kārshāpaṇa*. Smaller copper coins styled *Kākaṇi* were also in circulation. The name Kārshāpaṇa was also applied to silver and gold coins particularly in the south. Buddhist commentators distinguished between the old (porāṇa) *nila kahāpaṇa* (Kārshāpaṇa), apparently a silver coin, and the new type of coinage introduced by the satrap Rudradāman which was three-fourths of the old *Kārshāpaṇa* in weight. An old *Kārshāpaṇa* was equivalent to twenty *māshas* in certain areas and sixteen *māshas* in others. The actual weight of the extant silver coins of the western satraps is from thirty-four to thirty-six grains. The rate of exchange between the *Kārshāpaṇa* of thirty-six grains and the gold coins of the period, the *Suvarṇa* of one hundred and twenty-four grains, was as 1 to 35. The ratio of silver to gold at this time was approximately 1 to 10.

Industry

The importance of the manufacturing industry in the Maurya period is emphasised by the fact that one committee of the municipal board of Pāṭaliputra was specially entrusted with the supervision of manufactured articles in the metropolis. Greek writers make pointed reference to the manufacture of arms and agricultural implements and the building of ships mainly for purposes of river navigation. Strabo speaks of dresses worked in gold and adorned with precious stones and also flowered robes made of fine muslin worn by the wealthy classes, and umbrellas used by their attendants. Indian muslin was exported in large quantities to the Roman empire in the first century A.D. Muslins of the finest sort were then called Gangetic and were produced in the valley of the lower Ganges. The fame of Eastern Bengal and the Gangetic delta for its white and soft *dūkūla* is also vouched for by the *Kautilīya Arthaśāstra*. The fabric produced in Northern Bengal was black and as smooth as the surface of a gem. Muslins in great quantity were also exported from several market towns of southern India. The North-West was famous for its cotton cloth and silk yarn. The weaving industry gave employment to hundreds of helpless women and special arrangements were made for those who did not stir out of their houses. Weavers and other handicraftsmen were often organised into economic corporations called *Śreṇīs*. *Śreṇīs* or guilds were very much in evidence during this period. Records of the Sātavāhana age refer to guilds of weavers, braziers, oil-millers, bamboo-workers, corn-dealers, and of artisans fabricating hydraulic engines. These guilds often served the purpose of modern banks.

Religion

For a description of the state of religion in the days of the Imperial Mauryas and their successors we have to rely on Greek and Latin authors, inscriptions and coins, the *Mahābhāshya* of Patañjali and the testimony of later writers. The worship of the Vedic gods was still far from obsolescent. Zeus Ombrios, the rain-god, worshipped by the Indians, probably represents the Vedic Indra or Parjanya. Indra and Varuṇa are invoked as late as the Sātavāhana period. But side by side with them appear other deities whose popularity dates from the epic period. The river Ganges, for example, is mentioned as an object of worship by classical writers. Quintus Curtius states that an image of Herakles was carried in front of the army of Poros as he advanced against the Macedonian conqueror. The connection of the Indian Herakles with the Śūrasenas and the city of Mathurā suggests his identification with Vāsudeva or Saṅkarshaṇa. Patañjali refers to the exhibition and sale by the Mauryas of images of Śiva, Skanda and Viśākha. Skanda and Viśākha retained their popularity till the Kushāna period when they appeared on the coins of Huvishka. Even Aśoka, in many respects a great innovator, took pride in calling himself *devānaṁpiya*, Beloved of the Gods.

Sacrifices are very much in evidence during this age. Of the occasions on which the Maurya king, according to Strabo, went out in times of peace, one was for the performance of sacrifice. Sacrifices were also offered by private persons and the services of "philosophers" were requisitioned for the purpose. The people of India, generally sober, freely indulged in drink when these ceremonies were performed. Aśoka tried to put a stop to the killing of living creatures on such occasions. Vaishṇava reformers made an attempt to spiritualise sacrifices by giving them a new ethical meaning. But a great Brāhmaṇic revival followed the rise of the houses of Pushyamitra, Simuka-Sātavāhana and Śiva-skanda-varman Pallava. Rites like the *Aśvamedha* and *Vājapeya* came to be celebrated by princes on a grand scale.

From the beginning of the period Brāhmaṇism had to reckon with the heterodox creeds of the Ājīvikas, Jainas and Buddhists which obtained a firm hold on certain sections of the people, especially in Oudh, Bihār and Orissa. Tradition says that Chandragupta and Samprati of the Maurya dynasty were Jainas. The epithet *Vṛishala*, applied to the first Maurya by a Brāhmaṇical playwright, makes it likely that in his later days he swerved from strict orthodoxy. An undoubted Jaina king of this period

was Khāravela, who, strange to say, engaged in sanguinary conflicts with his neighbours in spite of the quietist teachings of the Arhats and Siddhas, saints and perfect beings, whom he invokes at the beginning of his inscription. Jainism enjoyed special pre-eminence at Mathurā during the early centuries of the Christian era along with the cult of the Nāgas or Serpent deities like Dadhikarṇa. The rival sect of the Ājīvikas enjoyed, like many other denominations, the bounty of the emperors Aśoka and Daśaratha who granted cave dwellings for these sectaries. If tradition is to be believed the Ājīvikas were also favoured by Bindusāra.

Buddhism, as is well known, secured the imperial patronage of Aśoka and became, mainly through his efforts, a world religion. It received marked favour from Menander and made a convert of the great Kanishka. But the Buddhism of Kanishka differed much from the simple ethical creed of the great Maurya. The human teacher of the four noble truths and the noble eight-fold path now became not merely a *deva* (deity) but *devātideva* (the god of gods). Like the Blessed Lord of the Bhāgavatas or Vaishṇavas he is repeatedly born in the world of the living to remove the affliction of creatures and reveal to them the true law. Images of the teacher now appear in Buddhist sculpture and receive the devout worship of the faithful, like the icons of Brāhmaṇic deities. Side by side with the Buddha appear the *dhyāni* Buddhas and Bodhisatvas. The newer Buddhism was known as the *Mahāyāna* or the Great Vehicle to distinguish it from the older creed which came to be styled *Hīnayāna*. The formulation of its basic ideas is associated with the name of Nāgārjuna, a philosopher of the Sātavāhana period. In the early centuries of the Christian era Buddhism spread to China and several other parts of central, eastern and southern Asia. The Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions make mention of the fraternities of monks who converted Kāshmīr, Gandhāra, China, Chilāta, Tosali, Aparānta, Vaṅga, Vanavāsi, Yavana, Damila, Palura and the island of Ceylon. The introduction of Buddhism into China is traditionally attributed to a sage named Kaśyapa Mātaṅga. There is, however, evidence to show that Buddhist scriptures were communicated to the Chinese by a Yue-chi Chief as early as 2 B.C.

Another Indian faith which showed great missionary activity was Bhāgavatism or Vaishṇavism, which already in the second century B.C. spread amongst the Greeks of the Indian borderland. Heliodoros, the ambassador of Antialkidas, king of Taxila, set up a Garuḍa column at Besnagar in honour of Vāsudeva, the God of gods. Several contemporary epigraphs bear testimony to

the prevalence, especially in Central India and the Deccan, of the cult of Vāsudeva and Saṅkarshaṇa, that is Kṛishṇa and his brother. The rival cult of Śiva enjoyed the patronage of Kadphises II and Vāsudeva Kushān. A foreign religion, Christianity, claims to have established some connection with the Indian borderland in the days of Gondophernes. The worship of Babylonian, Iranian and other non-Indian deities like Nanaia, Mithra or Mihira (Sun), Mao (Moon), and Pharro (Fire) in the Kushān empire is proved by numismatic evidence. The cult of Mihira attained much popularity, thanks to the endeavours of the Magian priesthood.

Literary Activity

It is difficult to assign any extant Indian work definitely to the Maurya age. Three works, the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*, the *Kalpasūtra* of Bhadrabāhu and the Buddhist *Kathā vatthu*, are traditionally attributed to personages who are said to have flourished in the Maurya period, but the ascription in all these cases has not met with general acceptance. A considerable body of literature is presupposed by Patañjali, usually regarded as a contemporary of Pushyamitra. Though many of the compositions mentioned by him existed long before the Mauryas, some of them may have been products of the Maurya epoch. The Grammarian knows the Pāṇḍu epic and refers to dramatic recitals and the performance of *Kaṁsabadha* (slaying of Kaṁsa by Kṛishṇa) and *Balibandha* (binding of Bali by Vishṇu in his Dwarf Incarnation). He also alludes to *ākhyānas* or tales of Yavakrīta, Yayāti, Vāsavadattā and others, and makes mention of a *Vārarucha Kāvya*. That parts of the *Mahābhārata* were composed during the Maurya or early post-Maurya period appears probable from references to the unconquerable Aśoka and also to a Yavana overlord of the lower Indus valley and his compatriot Dattāmitra, possibly Demetrios. The reference in the sister epic to mingled hordes of Yavanas and Śakas suggests that the *Rāmāyaṇa*, too, received accretions in the Graeco-Scythian age. The *Mānavadharma śāstra* which mentions the Yavanas, Śakas, Pāradas, and Pahlavas among Kshatriya clans which were degraded for non-observance of sacred rites and neglect of Brāhmaṇas may also be assigned to this period.

The epoch under review probably saw the composition of the *Mahābhāshya* of Patañjali, an exposition of the grammatical aphorisms of Pāṇini. Another grammatical work, the *Kātantra* or *Kalāpaka* of Śarvavarman, is traditionally assigned to the Sātavāhana period. To the same age probably belongs the *Brihat kathā*

of Guṇāḍhya. The *Gāthā Saptaśati* attributed to Hāla, a Śātavāhana king, bears signs of a much later date. The epoch of the Kushāns produced the great work of Aśvaghosha, poet, dramatist and philosopher. Among other celebrities of the period mention may be made of Charaka, Suśruta, Nāgārjuna, Kumāralāta and possibly Āryadeva.

The Pāli Buddhist canon is said to have been reduced to writing in the first century B.C. The celebrated work known as the *Milinda-pañho*, or the Questions of Menander, is also usually regarded as a product of the period under review. Some scholars believe that the astronomical work of Garga, the *Paumachariya* of Vimalasūri, portions of the *Divyāvadāna* as well as the *Lalitavistara* and the *Saddharma puṇḍarīka* are also to be assigned to this age.

Greek and Roman Influence

For centuries during the period under review India was in intimate contact with the Graeco-Roman world. Embassies were exchanged with the Hellenic powers by the sovereigns of Magadha and Mālwa. Indian philosophers, traders and adventurers were to be found in the intellectual circles of Athens and in the markets of Alexandria. The first of the Mauryas is said to have entered into a marriage contract with a Greek potentate. His son was eager to secure the services of a Greek sophist. The third and the greatest of the Mauryas entrusted the government of a wealthy province and the execution of important irrigation works to a Yavana chief. The services of Greek engineers seem to have been requisitioned by the greatest of the Kushāns in the early centuries of the Christian era. Greek influence on Indian coinage and iconography is unmistakable.

A Greek orator, Dion Chrysostom, informs us that the poetry of Homer was sung by the Indians, who had translated it into their own language and modes of expression so that even Indians were not unacquainted with the woes of Priam, the weeping and wailing of Andromache and Hecuba and the heroic feats of Achilles and Hector. The reference may be to the *Mahābhārata*, but the possibility of an actual translation of the Greek epic is not entirely excluded. Indian writers bear testimony to the proficiency of the Greeks in the sciences, and one author admits that they were honoured as though they were *Ṛishis* (Sages). Western singers were welcomed at the court of Broach. On the other hand Greek authors speak with admiration of the sages of India. Hellenic rulers and statesmen listened with respectful attention to Indian philosophers.

One of the greatest of the Indo-Greek kings, Menander, showed great predilection for Buddhist teaching and issued coins of Buddhist type. A Greek ambassador erected a Garuḍa column in honour of Vāsudeva. Greek *meridarchs* are mentioned in Kharoshṭhī inscriptions as establishing Buddhist relics and sanctuaries. Indian cultural influence on the Greeks of Egypt has been traced in the Oxyrhynchus papyri.

CHAPTER X

THE GUPTA EMPIRE

The Rise of the Gupta Power

THE Scythian conquerors of India had received their first great check in the Deccan. Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi of the Sātavāhana dynasty had extirpated the Kshaharāta race and dealt crushing blows to the Śakas, Yavanas, and Pahlavas. The power of the invaders was, however, still unshaken in the north where the "Son of Heaven" ruled in undiminished glory in the first part of the second century A.D. Even in Western India there was a Śaka revival under the great satrap Rudradāman I. Chinese evidence shows that the Yue-chi power was still far from being broken in A.D. 230. The rise of the Nāgas in the Jumnā valley pushed the Northern Scythians further towards the north-west borderland of India, but the descendants of Rudradāman continued to rule over the fair provinces of Mālwa and Kāṭhiāwār. The later Scythian rulers proved to be tyrants. A Brāhmaṇa historian of the seventh century A.D. refers to one of them as *Parakalatrakāmuka*, "coveting the wife of another". An epic poet makes the prophecy that Śakas and other *Mlechchha* (barbarian) kings will rule unrighteously in the evil age to come. The members of the four orders will not adhere to their duties and the country will become a desert. Harassed by barbarians the earth in an earlier epoch had taken refuge in the strong arms of Chandragupta Maurya. She now found shelter in another line of Chandraguptas.

Chandra Gupta I

The first Chandra Gupta of the new line, though the third member of his dynasty to be mentioned in inscriptions, was the earliest to assume the imperial title of *Mahārājādhirāja*, "supreme King of great Kings". Like the great Bimbisāra he strengthened his position by a matrimonial alliance with the powerful family of Lichchhavis then controlling portions of Bihār and perhaps even Nepāl. The Lichchhavi princess Kumāradevī must have

brought to her husband's family an enormous accession of power and prestige. Before the death of her husband the Gupta sway very probably extended to Allahābād, Oudh and South Bihār, territories assigned to the family by the Purāṇic chronicles at a time when the Nāga power was still unbroken in the Ganges-Jumnā valley. It is believed that the Gupta era commencing from A.D. 320 originated with Chandra Gupta I. An important act of this king was the holding of an assembly of councillors and members of the royal family at which Prince Samudra Gupta was formally nominated successor to the imperial throne of the Guptas.

Samudra Gupta

Samudra Gupta, the next king, is probably the greatest of his house. The exact limits of his reign are not known. He probably

SAMUDRA GUPTA

came to the throne sometime after A.D. 320 and died before A.D. 380, the earliest known date of his successor. He is not altogether unknown to tradition. He appears to be mentioned in the *Ārya-mañju-śrī-mūla kalpa*, and also in the *Tantrikāmandaka*, a Javanese text. A Chinese writer, Wang-hiuen-tse, refers to an embassy sent to him by Śrī Meghavarmá (-Vaṇṇa), king of Ceylon, to seek permission to build at Bodh-Gayā a monastery for Ceylonese pilgrims. But the most detailed and authentic record of his reign is preserved in a contemporary document, viz. the Allahābād Pillar Inscription, a eulogy of the emperor composed by Harisheṇa.

There is also another contemporary epigraph found at Eran in Madhya Pradesh. Certain copper plates purporting to belong to his reign are regarded by scholars as spurious. Samudra Gupta also left an extensive coinage. Some important events of his reign are known from this source and the records of his successors.

The eulogy of Harisheṇa is damaged in several parts so that it is difficult to follow the sequence of events. The Gupta monarch seems at first to have made an onslaught on the neighbouring realms of Ahichchhatrā (Rohilkhaṇḍ) and Padmāvatī (in Central India) then ruled by Achyuta and Nāgasena. He captured a prince of the Kota family and then rested on his laurels for a period in the city named Pushpa, i.e. Pāṭaliputra. Whether the Kota dynasty actually ruled in Pushpapura or Pāṭaliputra about this time, and were dispossessed of it by the Gupta conqueror, is not made clear in the damaged epigraph that has come down to us. Other indications point to Śrāvastī or a territory still farther to the north as the realm where the *Kota-kula* ruled. A subsequent passage of the inscription names along with Achyuta and Nāgasena several other princes of Āryāvarta or the upper Ganges valley and some adjoining tracts, who were violently exterminated. These include Rudradeva, Matila, Nāgadatta, Chandravarman, Ganapati Nāga, Nandin and Balavarman. The identity of most of the princes named in this list is still uncertain. Matila has been connected by some scholars with the Bulandshahr district in the centre of the Ganges–Jumnā Doāb, while Ganapati Nāga seems to be associated by numismatic evidence with Narwar and Besnagar in Central India. Chandravarman is a more elusive but interesting figure. Suggestions have been made that he is identical with a ruler of the same name, the son of Siṁhavarman, mentioned as the lord of Pushkarana in an inscription discovered at Śuśunia in the Bankura district of Western Bengal. His name has also been traced in the famous Chandravarmankoṭ in the Kotwalipāḍā pargana of the Faridpur district of Eastern Bengal. Bolder theorists have identified his father Siṁhavarman with a prince of Mandasor, the father of Naravarman, and located Pushkarana at Pokarna in Mārwār. Some have gone so far as to suggest that the Chandravarman of Samudra Gupta's record is not only a ruler of Rājputāna and a brother of Naravarman of Mandasor, but he is no other than the great emperor Chandra of the Meherauli Iron Pillar near Delhi. The last-mentioned scholars were apparently not aware of the existence of a place called Pokharan in the district of Bankura itself near the site of the record of Chandravarman. They also forget that no prince bearing the name

Chandravarman, still less a Chandravarman of Pokarna in Mārwār, is mentioned in any record of the Mandasor family, and that King Chandra of the Meherauli epigraph, who is called simply Chandra and not Chandravarman, is an emperor, the reputed conqueror of the whole of India, who can hardly be identified with the ruler of Samudra Gupta's record who is classed with a host of comparatively insignificant princes.

The great Gupta conqueror is next represented as reducing to the status of servants the forest kings apparently of the Vindhyan region. In an earlier passage we have reference to a grand expedition to the south in the course of which the emperor captured and again set at liberty all the kings of the Deccan. The rulers specially named in this connection are Mahendra of Kosala in the Upper Mahānadī valley, Vyāghra-rāja or the Tiger king of the great wilderness named Mahākāntāra, Manṭarāja of Kurala, Mahendragiri of Pishṭapura or Pithapuram in the Godāvarī district, Svāmidatta of Koṭṭura somewhere in the northern part of the Madras Presidency, Damana of Eraṇḍapalla possibly in the same region, Vishṇugopa, the Pallava king of Kāñchī in the Chingleput district, Nīlarāja of Avamukta, Hastivarman, the Śālaṅkāyana king of Veṅgī lying between the Godāvarī and the Kṛishṇā, Ugrasena of Palakka, probably in the Nellore district, Kubera of Devarāshṭra in the Vizagapatam district and Dhanañjaya of Kusthalapur, possibly in North Arcot.

The reference to the liberation of the southern potentates shows that no attempt was made to incorporate the kingdoms of the Deccan south of the Nerbudda and the Mahānadī into the Gupta empire. From the territorial point of view the result of the brilliant campaigns of Samudra Gupta was the addition to the Gupta dominions described in the Purāṇas, of Rohilkhaṇḍ, the Ganges–Jumnā Doāb, part of Eastern Mālwa, perhaps some adjoining tracts and several districts of Bengal. The annexation of part of Eastern Mālwa is confirmed by the Eran inscription. The suzerainty of the great Gupta, as distinguished from his direct rule, extended over a much wider area, and his imperious command was obeyed by princes and peoples far beyond the frontiers of the provinces directly administered by his own officers. Among his vassals we find mention of the kings of Samataṭa (in Eastern Bengal), Ḍavāka (probably near Nowgong in Assam), Kāmarūpa (in Western Assam), Nepāl, Kartṛipura (Garhwal and Jalandhar) and several tribal states of the eastern and central Punjab, Mālwa and Western India, notably the Mālavas, Yaudheyas, Madrakas, Ābhīras and Sanakānīkas. The descendants of the Kushān "Son of Heaven",

many chieftains of the Śakas, the Ceylonese and several other insular peoples hastened to propitiate the great Gupta by the offer of homage and tribute or presents. It was presumably after his military triumphs that the emperor completed the famous rite of the horse-sacrifice.

Great as were the military laurels won by Samudra Gupta, his personal accomplishments were no less remarkable. His court poet extols his magnanimity towards the fallen, his polished intellect, his knowledge of the scriptures, his poetic skill and his proficiency in music. The last trait of the emperor's character is well illustrated by the lyrist type of his coins. He gathered round himself a galaxy of poets and scholars, not the least eminent among whom was the warrior-poet Harisheṇa who resembled his master in his versatility. Both Samudra Gupta and Aśoka set before their minds the ideal of world-conquest by means of *parākrama*. *Parākrama*, in the case of the Maurya, was not warlike activity but vigorous and effective action to propagate the old Indian morality as well as the special teaching of the Buddha. In the case of the Gupta it was an intense military and intellectual activity intended to bring about the political unification of *Āryāvarta*, the discomfiture of the foreign tormentors of the holy land and an efflorescence of the old Indian culture in all its varied aspects—religious, poetic, artistic.

Chandra Gupta II Vikramāditya

Samudra Gupta was succeeded, according to contemporary epigraphs, by his son Chandra Gupta II surnamed Vikramāditya who ruled from *c.* A.D. 380 to 413. Some writers have traced hints in literature of uncertain date and in inscriptions of the ninth and tenth centuries A.D., that the immediate successor of Samudra Gupta was his son Rāma Gupta, a weak ruler, who consented to surrender his wife Dhruvadevī to a Śaka tyrant. The honour of the queen was saved by Chandra Gupta, younger brother of Rāma Gupta, who killed the Śaka, replaced his brother on the imperial throne and married Dhruvadevī. We do not know how far the story embodies genuine historical tradition. No prince named Rāma Gupta is known to contemporary epigraphy, and the story shows signs of growth. The earliest version to which a definite date may be assigned is that of Bāṇa who simply refers to the destruction of a libidinous Śaka king by Chandra Gupta disguised as a female. There is no reference here either to Rāma Gupta or to Dhruvadevī. The matter should, therefore, be

regarded as *sub judice* and can only be decided when contemporary evidence confirming the story is forthcoming.

Chandra Gupta II carried on the policy of "world-conquest" pursued by his predecessor. He effected his purpose partly by pacific overtures and partly by military activity. Political marriages occupy a prominent place in the foreign policy of the Guptas as of the Hapsburgs and Bourbons of Europe. The Lichchhavi alliance of the real founder of the dynasty, and the acceptance of presents of maidens from the courts of contemporary potentates by Samudra Gupta, served to consolidate the nascent Gupta power as the Rajput marriages strengthened that of the Timurid sovereigns of a later date. A further step in the same direction was taken by Chandra Gupta II when he conciliated the Nāga chieftains of the upper and central provinces by accepting the hand of the princess Kuberanāgā and allied himself with the powerful family of the Vākāṭakas of the Deccan by giving his daughter Prabhāvatī in marriage to Rudrasena II. Thus strengthened, the king marched to Eastern Mālwa accompanied by his minister Vīrasena-Śāba and possibly his general Āmrakārddava. He received the homage of the Sanakānika chieftain of the locality and took measures to wipe out Śaka rule in Western Mālwa and Kāṭhiāwār. His efforts were crowned with success as we know from the evidence of coins and of Bāṇa's *Harsha-charita*.

On many of his coins Chandra Gupta II receives the epithet Vikramāditya. In certain records of the twelfth century A.D. he is represented as the lord of the city of Ujjain as well as Pāṭaliputra. The cool courage he showed in going to fight with the Śakas and killing their chieftain in the enemy's own city entitles him to the epithets "*Sāhasāṅka*" and "*Śakāri*". These facts have led scholars to identify him with the Vikramāditya Śakāri of legend, whose court is said to have been adorned by "nine gems" including Kālidāsa and Varāhamihira. The tradition about the nine gems is, however, late. It is uncertain if all of them actually flourished about the same time. Varāhamihira at any rate is to be placed after Āryabhaṭa, who was born in the latter half of the fifth century A.D. But if Mallinātha is to be believed, Kālidāsa may have been a contemporary of Chandra Gupta II, for the great commentator mentions as one of his opponents the famous Dignāgāchārya who is assigned to this period.

Another notable contemporary of Chandra Gupta II was Fa Hien. The celebrated Chinese pilgrim was struck with admiration by the famous royal palace and the houses for dispensing charity

and medicine at Pātaliputra. He speaks highly of the system of government in the Madhya-deśa and the benevolence of the people, especially the moneyed classes.

Kumāra Gupta I and Skanda Gupta

The successor of Chandra Gupta II was his son Kumāra Gupta I Mahendrāditya, whose known dates range from A.D. 415 to 455. He maintained his hold over the vast empire of his forebears, which now extended from North Bengal to Kāṭhiāwār and from the Himālayas to the Nerbudda. Numismatic evidence seems to suggest that his influence at one time extended southwards, possibly as far as the Satara district of the Deccan. His achievements were sufficiently remarkable to entitle him to perform the famous rite of the horse-sacrifice. But his last days were not happy. A people known as the Pushyamitras, probably located in or near Mekala in the Nerbudda valley, developed great power and wealth and reduced the imperial government to such straits that a prince imperial had to spend a whole night on bare earth. The sovereign himself seems to have perished before the issues were finally decided in favour of the imperial family, mainly through the exertions of Prince Skanda Gupta.

The victorious prince had soon to deal with a more formidable enemy, the Huns. But he succeeded in repelling their early invasions and recovering most of the imperial provinces, which were placed under special Wardens of the Marches. In one inscription the goddess of royal fortune is said to have chosen him as her lord, having discarded the other princes. The full import of this passage is somewhat obscure. It is, however, certain that the superior ability and prowess of Skanda Gupta in a time of crisis led to his choice as ruler in preference to other possible claimants. The choice of Harshà in the seventh century apparently furnishes a parallel.

Proud of his success against the barbarians Skanda Gupta assumed the title of Vikramāditya. The memory of his achievements is popularly preserved in the story of Vikramāditya, son of Mahendrāditya, narrated in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. The reign of Skanda Gupta probably terminated about A.D. 467.

The Last Days of the Gupta Empire

The history of the ensuing period is obscure. Inscriptions prove that the Gupta sovereignty was acknowledged in the Jabbalpur

region in the Nerbudda valley as late as A.D. 528, and in North Bengal till A.D. 543–544. A Kumāra Gupta is known to have been ruling in A.D. 473–474, a Budha Gupta from A.D. 476–477 to *c.* A.D. 495, a Vainya Gupta in or about A.D. 508 and a Bhānu Gupta in A.D. 510–511. Bhitari and Nālandā seal inscriptions disclose the names of four kings, Puru Gupta, son of Kumāra Gupta I; Narasiṁha Gupta (Bālāditya), son of Puru Gupta; Kumāra Gupta, son of Narasiṁha, and Vishṇu Gupta, son of Kumāra Gupta, who must be assigned to this obscure period. Narasiṁha Bālāditya has been identified with the conqueror of Mihiragula, a Hun tyrant, whose power was finally broken before A.D. 533–534. But the existence of several Bālādityas renders this identification doubtful. Another theory splits up the Gupta dynasty into two rival branches, one of which consisted of the kings mentioned in the Bhitari and Nālandā seals. The other included Kumāra Gupta of A.D. 473–474, Budha Gupta and Bhānu Gupta. But Budha Gupta is now known to have been a son of Puru Gupta, and the incontrovertible facts of his reign render the theory of a partition of the empire in the closing years of the fifth century A.D. unworthy of credence. A more plausible conjecture identifies Kumāra, son of Narasiṁha, with the Kumāra Gupta who ruled in A.D. 473–474. The only difficulty in accepting this view is the abnormal shortness of the period assignable to Puru Gupta and his son Narasiṁha (A.D. 467–473). But the difficulty is not insuperable, and we know of other instances of short reigns in the later days of an imperial dynasty.

Inscriptions make it clear that the Gupta empire maintained some sort of unity till the days of Budha Gupta (476–495) though it might have lost some of its westernmost provinces. After Budha Gupta the Huns, under Toramāna and Mihirakula or Mihiragula, undoubtedly pushed their conquests deep into the Indian interior as far as Eran in Eastern Mālwa. But the Huns received a check in the time of a king named Bālāditya who may have been identical with Bhānu Gupta, the hero of a "very famous battle" fought in the region of Eran. The Hun imperial power was finally shattered by Yaśodharman, an energetic and ambitious chief of Mandasor in Western Mālwa before A.D. 533–534. Yaśodharman seems to have made use of his victory to establish his own supremacy. But the Gupta power undoubtedly survived in North Bengal till A.D. 543–544. Even in later times we find a king whose name ended in Gupta fighting on the banks of the Brahmaputra. Other "Gupta" princes who are associated with Mālwa and Magadha came into contact with the rising power of the Pushyabhūti family of Thānesar and Kanauj in the latter half

of the sixth and first half of the seventh century A.D. These "Later Guptas" restored the glory of the line to a certain extent under Ādityasena in the latter half of the seventh century, and used titles indicative of imperial rank. They disappeared in the eighth century when Magadha became the battle-ground of the rival empires of Yaśovarman of Kanauj and an unnamed king of Gauda lineage. Whether the Later Guptas were connected in any way with the Imperial Guptas is not known.

CHAPTER XI

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE HUNS, AND THE ASCENDANCY OF KANAUJ, KĀSHMĪR AND GAUḌA

The Huns

In spite of the heroic efforts of Skanda Gupta, the Gupta empire in its entirety did not long survive the shock it received from the uprising of the Pushyamitras and the incursions of the Huns. The hereditary character of the officialdom, particularly in some of the outlying provinces, must have let loose centrifugal forces which gathered strength as the central authority weakened owing to the onslaughts of the barbarians. There were signs of degeneration and of dissension in the imperial line itself, and the devotion of the more loyal feudatories could not save the empire from its impending doom. So far as our present knowledge goes Budha Gupta was the last emperor of the main line of the Guptas who preserved some semblance of unity in the major part of the empire. When he passed away the Huns were safely entrenched in the Śiālkoṭ region and Eastern Mālwa, provinces that had owned the Gupta suzerainty since the days of Samudra Gupta.

The Huns were a race of fierce barbarians who issued from the steppes of Central Asia and had in the fifth century A.D. spread in devastating hordes over some of the fairest provinces of the Roman empire in the West and the Gupta empire in India. Their early incursions into India were repulsed by Skanda Gupta, but they renewed their attacks when the great emperor was no more. Towards the close of the fifth and early in the sixth century A.D. the Hun suzerainty rapidly spread in all directions, thanks to the vigour and energy of Toramāna and his son Mihiragula. The last-mentioned ruler is known not only from inscriptions and coins, but from tradition recorded by Hiuen Tsang and Kalhaṇa, both of whom bear witness to his tyrannical rule. He has further been identified with the White Hun King Gollas mentioned by the monk Cosmas Indikopleustes, and also with the Yetha ruler of Gandhāra to whom Song Yun, the Chinese pilgrim, paid a visit in A.D. 520. An account of his feats is also supposed to be preserved in the Jaina stories about Kalkirāja. The expansion of the Hun

rule in Central India seems to have been checked by the loyal feudatories of the Guptas, and their imperial power was finally shattered by Yaśodharman of Mandasor. Petty Hun chieftains continued to rule over a circumscribed area in North-West India and Mālwa, waging a perpetual warfare with the indigenous princes till they were absorbed into the Rājput population. It is significant that the new aspirants for imperial dominion in Āryāvarta, Yaśodharman, the Maukharis, the princes of the house of Pushyabhūti, and the Pālas set much store on success against these outlandish barbarians who harassed their country as the Yavanas and Śaka-Pahlavas did of old.

Yaśodharman

Yaśodharman probably belonged to an old family known as Aulikara whose members ruled in Malwa since the 4th century A.D., first as independent rulers and then as feudatories of the Guptas. He was a Śaiva ruler who has left records of his achievements at Mandasor. In these he claims to have granted protection to the earth when it was afflicted by the cruel and vicious kings of the age who transgressed the rules of good conduct. He is further described as a *Samrāṭ* or emperor who extended his sway over territories which even the all-conquering Gupta lords and Hun chieftains had failed to subdue. Homage was done to him by chiefs from the neighbourhood of the Brahmaputra up to the Eastern Ghāṭs and from the snowy heights of the Himālayas down to the Western Ocean. The Hun king Mihiragula, whose head had never previously been bowed in the humility of obeisance to any mortal, was compelled to do reverence to Yaśodharman's feet.

Portions of Mālwa were governed by the Maitrakas, Kalachuris and Guptas shortly after Yaśodharman. The imitation of Gupta coins and assumption of titles characteristic of kings of the Gupta family by the Kalachuris show that no wide interval separates their rule from that of the last of the Imperial Guptas of Mālwa.

The dominant powers in India in the latter half of the sixth century A.D. were the Maukharis in the Ganges valley and the Chalukyas of the Deccan. The history of the Chalukyas will be treated in a later chapter.

The Maukharis

The Maukharis claimed descent from Aśvapati of epic fame. They figured as feudatory chieftains or generals in Magadha and Rājputāna from very early times and possibly came into contact with

the Kadambas of South-West India. The family rose to prominence under Īśānavarman, who is the first to assume the imperial title of *Mahārājādhirāja* or supreme king of great kings. From a record of his reign dated A.D. 554 we learn that he won victories over the Andhras, the Śūlikas and the Gauḍas. The Andhras and the Śūlikas may have reference to the rulers of the Vishṇukuṇḍin and Chalukya families of the Eastern and Western Deccan, while the Gauḍas, whose "proper realm" lay not far from the sea, are apparently the people of Bengal. Īśānavarman also came into conflict with the later Gupta king, Kumāra Gupta, probably the third or fourth monarch of that name. The son of the latter is represented as "breaking up the proudly stepping array of mighty elephants, belonging to the Maukhari, which had thrown aloft in battle the troops of the Huns". It is clear that the Maukharis, like Skanda Gupta and Yaśodharman, carried on the struggle against the foreign invaders, the destruction of whose power was necessary to realise their dream of restoring the fallen fabric of imperialism in Northerr India.

Īśānavarman was followed by at least three other princes, Śarvavarman, Avantivarman, and Grahavarman. The last-mentioned ruler was a son of Avantivarman. He married Rājyaśrī, daughter of Prabhākaravardhana of the Pushyabhūti family of Thānesar and sister to Rājyavardhana and his more celebrated brother Harsha. But the alliance could not save the Maukhari ruler from destruction at the hands of the "wicked lord of Mālava", who has been plausibly identified with Deva Gupta of the inscriptions of Harsha. Rājyaśrī, the widowed Maukhari queen, was cast into prison at Kanauj. The death of Grahavarman was avenged by his brother-in-law Rājyavardhana, the eldest son and successor of Prabhākaravardhana. But Rājyavardhana himself was killed by Śaśāṅka. It has been alleged by the court poet of Thaneswar that Rājyavardhana was "allured into confidence by false civilities on the part of (Śaśāṅka) the king of Gauda, and then weaponless, confiding and alone, despatched in his own quarters". The truth of this unconfirmed statement may be doubted.

Harsha

At this juncture the statesmen of Kanauj, on the advice of their leading noble Bani (Bhaṇḍi), seem to have offered the crown to Harsha, the brother of Rājyavardhana and of Rājyaśrī, who was destined to revive the imperial memories of the Gupta epoch and obtain recognition as the lord paramount of the whole of

Northern India, even from his bitterest enemies. The event happened in A.D. 606, the starting-point of the Harsha era. Both Bāṇa and Hiuen Tsang refer to Harsha's reluctance to mount the throne. This is taken by some to be due to the fact that he was not the rightful heir to the throne of Kanauj, which may have formed part of the dominions of his sister's Maukhari husband whose line was not yet extinct. But this view does not explain Harsha's hesitation to succeed his elder brother. The true history of the period will only be made clear when further evidence is forthcoming. It is, however, certain that Harsha found himself at the head of the kingdom of his brother as well as that of his brother-in-law. But he contented himself at first with the modest title of *Rājaputra* (Prince) Śīlāditya.

The dynasty to which Harsha belonged claimed descent from the illustrious Pushyabhūti, a devoted worshipper of Śiva. It ruled at Thānesar and was raised to greatness by Prabhākaravardhana, father of Harsha, who was the son of a princess, possibly of "later Gupta" lineage. He took the title of *Mahārājādhirāja* and played the part of "a lion to the Hun deer". As already related he offered the hand of his daughter Rājyaśrī to Grahavarman Maukhari and thus formed an alliance between the two most powerful families of the Madhya-deśa (upper Ganges valley) which resembled the solar and lunar races of antiquity. The vicissitudes through which the kingdom of Thānesar passed in the time of Rājyavardhana, his immediate successor, have been mentioned above. Harsha on coming to the throne had to face a sea of troubles. He had to rescue his sister, the Maukhari queen Rājyaśrī, the widow of Grahavarman, who had fled from the place of her confinement at Kanauj. He had to avenge the death of his elder brother and predecessor, and he had to consolidate his authority in the two kingdoms over which he was called upon to rule. One of his earliest acts was a treaty of alliance with Bhāskaravarman, the ambitious king of Kāmarūpa in modern Assam, who was in a position to attack his arch-enemy, the king of Gauḍa, in the rear. Another prince befriended by Harsha was Mādhava Gupta, belonging to the line of the "later Guptas" of Mālwa and Magadha. The recovery of Rājyaśrī was effected within a short time by Harsha himself, who was accompanied by Mādhava Gupta, while Bhaṇḍ was ordered to proceed against the king of Gauḍa. Harsha is said to have waged incessant warfare until in six years he had fought the 'Five Indies'. Śaśāṅka of Gauḍa proved a formidable opponent and his power seems to have continued undiminished till A.D. 619. Harsha, however, succeeded in strengthening his position in the

home territories, and in 612 assumed full regal titles. He increased his army, bringing the elephant corps up to 60,000 and the cavalry to 100,000.

During the period 618–627 Chinese chroniclers record serious disturbances in India, and Śīlāditya (Harsha) is represented as punishing the kings of the four parts of the country. What specific contests are meant is not made clear by the Chinese writers. But we learn from Chalukya records that sometime before 634 Harsha marched southwards as far as the Nerbudda, where his further progress was stopped by Pulakesin II of the Chalukya dynasty of Vātāpi in the Deccan. A record of the Gurjara chiefs of Broach refers to the defeat by Harsha of a prince of Valabhī who was granted protection by Dadda II. At the time of Hiuen Tsang's visit to Valabhī, *c.* 641, the reigning prince of Valabhī, Dhruvabhaṭa, was attached to Harsha's interest by a matrimonial alliance. Śaśāṅka, king of Gauḍa, must have died sometime before 637 when Hiuen Tsang was at Nālandā in South Bihār. For a time Magadha passed under the rule of Pūrṇavarman. In 641 Śīlāditya (Harsha) himself assumed the title of king of Magadha and exchanged embassies with China. According to tradition he had led an expedition to Northern Bengal. The final overthrow of the Gauḍa kingdom of Karṇasuvarṇa seems to have been the work of his ally Bhāskaravarman whose Nidhanapur grant is issued from that city. The exact date of this event is not known. In 642 death probably removed Pulakesin II, the formidable southern rival of Harsha, and in the next year the northern emperor undertook an expedition to Gañjām. We have also references in literature to Harsha's expedition to the *Tushāra śaila* or snowy mountains, whence he exacted tribute, to Kāshmīr from which he carried off a tooth relic, and to Sind whose ruler was deprived of his royal fortune. We do not know to which period of Harsha's reign these events are to be assigned.

Much controversy has raged round the question of the extent of Harsha's empire. It certainly embraced the old kingdoms of Thānesar (in the eastern Punjab) and Kanauj (in the Gangetic Doāb) and the provinces of Ahichchhatrā (Rohilkhaṇḍ), Śrāvastī (Oudh) and Prayāga (Allahābād). Chinese evidence points to the inclusion of Magadha since 641 and also of Orissa. Udita of Jālandhar and Mādhava Gupta, apparently of Eastern Mālwa, seem so have been his vassals. The emperor's army had overrun almost the whole of Northern India, from the snowy mountains of the north to the Nerbudda in the south, and from Gañjām in the east to Valabhī in the west. The king of Kāmarūpa beyond the Brah-

maputra was his ally, and the real character of the alliance was well illustrated by an episode recorded by a Chinese writer which shows that the eastern potentate acknowledged the superiority of Harsha's might and did not dare disobey his orders. Even the most powerful of Harsha's enemies, viz. the Chalukyas of the Deccan, bear witness to his suzerainty over the whole of Uttarāt patha or Northern India. The pre-eminence of Harsha over other contemporary rulers of the North is also indicated by the "music-pace-drums" which he alone was entitled to use, other kings not being permitted to adopt the paraphernalia in question. It is not suggested that the whole of Northern India was actually controlled by imperial officials. Large tracts of this wide region were doubtless under powerful local rulers who owed only a nominal allegiance to the imperial throne. But even the rulers of distant Kāshmīr, Sind, Valabhī, and Kāmarūpa had a wholesome dread of the power of Harsha. The king of Kāmarūpa dared not detain a Chinese pilgrim at his capital against the will of his mighty "ally", and the king of Kāshmīr was compelled to surrender a tooth relic to Harsha. The ruler of Sind, already humbled by Prabhākaravardhana, was, according to Bāṇa, shorn of his royal fortune by Harsha. The ruler of Valabhī had once fled before the advancing arms of the Kanauj monarch, and later on accepted the hand of his daughter and attended the imperial court.

Kanauj, the imperial capital, had the Ganges on its west side. It is described by Hiuen Tsang as a very strongly defended city with lofty structures everywhere. There were beautiful gardens and tanks of clear water. Rarities from strange lands were collected here. The inhabitants were well off and there were families with great wealth. The people had a refined appearance and dressed in glossy silk attire. They were given to learning and the arts.

Harsha did not long survive the Gañjām campaign of A.D. 643. In his later days he received embassies from China and maintained close diplomatic relations with the Chinese court. At this period he came into contact with Hiuen Tsang, the Chinese Master of the Law, who was visiting the sacred spots of Buddhism. It appears from the records of the Chinese pilgrim that the emperor of Kanauj showed a strong predilection for Buddhism, though he does not seem to have discarded altogether the Śaivism of his earlier years. He caused the use of animal food to cease throughout his dominions and prohibited the taking of life. He erected rest-houses and monasteries and practised charity on an extensive scale.

In 643 the Chinese pilgrim witnessed two grand assemblies, one in the city of Kanauj, the other the quinquennial assembly known as

the *Mahāmokshaparishad*, in the "arena of charitable offerings" at Prayāga (Allahābād). The Kanauj assembly was summoned to honour Hiuen Tsang and the Mahāyāna form of Buddhism which he preached. It was attended by twenty kings, besides thousands of Buddhist, Brāhmaṇical and Jaina theologians and priests. Impressive spectacles were presented by a golden statue of the Buddha kept in a lofty tower and a gorgeous procession of elephants that escorted an image of the Śākya sage to the hall of assembly. The gathering at Prayāga included about 500,000 people who had been summoned from the distant corners of the "Five Indies" to receive gifts from the emperor. Harsha went to the spot accompanied by the Chinese Master of the Law and the kings of twenty countries. Images of the Buddha, Ādityadeva (the Sun), and Īśvaradeva (Śiva) were installed on successive days and precious articles were distributed in charity on each occasion. When the accumulation of five years was exhausted, the emperor wore a second-hand garment and paid worship to the Buddhas of the ten regions.

Harsha died in A.D. 646 or 647. He was undoubtedly one of the greatest kings of ancient India. Called upon to rule over two distracted kingdoms in a period of turmoil he succeeded to a large extent in restoring respect for authority in vast tracts of Northern India and won praise as a just and benevolent ruler, punctilious in the discharge of his duties. It is not surprising that years of strenuous warfare did not allow him much time to establish on a firm foundation that ordered government which three generations of Gupta emperors had given to the "middle country", the benefits of which were warmly appreciated by Fa Hien. It was, however, not due to any lack of vigour on his part. This indefatigable prince was anxious to bring justice to the doors of all. He made visits of inspection throughout his dominions and was prompt to reward the virtuous and punish the evil-doer. But he nursed a higher ambition. The grandson of a "Gupta" princess, Harsha attempted to revive the imperial memories of Samudra Gupta and sought to unite the north and south of India under one sceptre —in vain as the sequel proved. But the imperial splendour of Kanauj that he did so much to augment was hardly dimmed in succeeding ages, and rulers of the remotest corners of India counted it their proudest boast to have "captured Mahodaya-Śrī", i.e. conquered Kanauj. Harsha also showed a taste for literature and the arts of peace that reminds one of the versatile hero, Samudra Gupta. In his later days he sought to emulate, perhaps unconsciously, the great Aśoka, and the Chinese pilgrim bears eloquent testimony to his pious foundations, his toleration, liberality and

benevolence, all irrespective of caste and creed. One European writer calls him the Akbar of the Hindu period. A great general and a just administrator, he was even greater as a patron of religion and learning. He gathered round himself some of the finest intellects and holiest sages—men like Bāṇa, Mayūra, Divākara and Hiuen Tsang. In one respect he is more fortunate than Samudra Gupta, for we still possess some gems of literature that proceeded, according to tradition, from his pen.

The Kanauj Empire after Harsha

Harsha died either at the end of A.D. 646 or the beginning of 647. The removal of his strong personality let loose forces of disintegration and disorder in the Madhya-deśa (upper Ganges valley). After a reign extending over more than forty years Harsha transmitted his crown to successors who must have struggled to maintain their heritage for some time. Attempts were made by princes like Yaśovarman, and possibly Indra-rāja to restore the fallen fabric of imperialism and win for Kanauj that proud position which it once occupied under Harsha. But their efforts were frustrated by the war-like potentates beyond the limits of the Madhya-deśa to whom the acquisition of the imperial seat of Harsha was the goal of political ambition. The history of the upper Ganges valley from the end of 646 to 836 is one of internal strife and of external invasion which ended when the royal throne of Harsha passed into the hands of the Pratihāras.

It is doubtful if Harsha left a son. He had a daughter who was given in marriage to Dhruvabhaṭa of Valabhī. It is significant that in the Gupta years 326–330, which almost synchronise with Harsha's death, Dharasena IV, son of Dhruvabhaṭa, assumed the imperial titles of *Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Parameśvara Chakravartī*. He doubtless looked upon himself as the imperial successor in Western India of the Kanauj monarch, who may have been his maternal grandfather. Among other pretenders were a brother of Grahavarman, and one of Harsha's ministers named Arjuna or Arunāśva. The latter seized some provinces in the Ganges valley and came into conflict with a Chinese mission headed by Wang-hiuen-tse. The Chinese envoy received assistance from Tibet and Nepāl and inflicted crushing defeats on the enemy. He also obtained large supplies of cattle and accoutrements from Kumāra (Bhāskaravarman), king of Kāmarūpa, and carried off the usurping minister to China.

In A.D. 672 the most powerful sovereign in the Madhya-deśa

was Ādityasena, son of Mādhava Gupta, the ally of Harsha. Ādityasena signalised his accession to power by the performance of the horse-sacrifice. He strengthened his position by matrimonial alliances with the most illustrious families of his age. Himself a scion of the "later Gupta" dynasty of Mālwa and Magadha, he gave his daughter in marriage to Bhogavarman Maukhari. His granddaughter, born of Bhogavarman's wife, became the queen of Śivadeva of Nepāl, and mother of Jayadeva. This Jayadeva married Rājyamatī, daughter of Harshadeva of the Bhagadatta family of Kāmarūpa.

Ādityasena was followed by three "Gupta" successors, Deva Gupta, Vishṇu Gupta, and Jīvita Gupta II. Early in the eighth century the throne of Magadha is found in the occupation of a Gauḍa king.

But the Gauḍas were not left in undisturbed possession of Magadha for any length of time. The kingdom of Kanauj revived about this time under the vigorous rule of Yaśovarman, a prince claiming descent from the Lunar race, whose exploits are described in the *Prākrit* work entitled the *Gauḍavaho* by Vākpatirāja. The career of Yaśovarman reminds one of the great Harsha. He led an expedition against the Gauḍa king and killed him in battle. Having next subjugated the Vaṅgas of Eastern and Central Bengal he turned to the south and reached the Nerbudda. After a brief stay on the banks of that river he returned to his capital through the desert of Rājputāna and the plain of Thānesar. Like Harsha he maintained diplomatic intercourse with the Chinese empire (A.D. 731). He extended his patronage to the illustrious poets Bhavabhūti and Vākpatirāja. In the end this enterprising prince roused the hostility of Lalitāditya, king of Kāshmīr, and perished in a conflict with his mighty northern adversary.

Kāshmīr

Kāshmīr now appears on the scene as a keen competitor of the Gangetic powers. The valley had formed part of the empires of Aśoka, Kanishka and Mihiragula. In the seventh century A.D. it grew into a first-rate power under a local dynasty, styled Kārkoṭa, founded by Durlabhavardhana. Two grandsons of Durlabhavardhana, Chandrāīdpa and Muktāpīḍa Lalitāditya, succeeded him. Lalitāditya was an ambitious prince. We have already referred to his victory over Yaśovarman of Kanauj. Kalhaṇa, the historian of Kāshmīr, credits him with having led his troops to distant countries. The account of these exploits mostly reads like the

conventional panegyric of an epic hero. More importance attaches to those parts of Kalhaṇa's narrative which refer to his triumphs over Tibetans, Dards and the Turks on the Indus and the slaughter of a king of Gauḍa. Lalitāditya is justly eulogised for his pious foundations, among which the famous temple of Mārtāṇḍa stands pre-eminent.

Jayāpīḍa Vinayāditya emulated the exploits of his grandfather, Lalitāditya, by defeating the kings of Gauḍa and Kanauj. He was a great patron of learning and his court was adorned by Kshīrasvāmin, Udbhaṭa, Dāmodara Gupta, Vāmaṇa and other scholars. His fiscal exactions, however, made his name odious. His dynasty came to an end in A.D. 855 and was supplanted by the house of Utpala.

Avantivarman, the founder of the new line, is famous for his irrigation works carried out under the direction of his minister Suyya. The next king, Śaṅkaravarman, son of Avantivarman, extended the boundaries of Kāshmīr in several directions. He seems to have come into conflict with the emperor Bhoja I of Kanauj and Lalliya Shāhi of Udabhāṇḍapura or Und on the Indus, and wrested a portion of the Punjab from the Gurjaras. Like Jayāpīḍa of the previous dynasty he harassed the people by fiscal extortions and met his end in a conflict with the people of Uraśā, the modern Hazāra district. A period of turmoil followed. The widowed queen Sugandhā attempted to rule in the name of puppet kings. But she had to encounter formidable opposition from the powerful military factions of the *Tantrins* who made themselves virtual dictators of the state. The *Tantrins* were eventually put down by certain feudal chiefs. In the end an assembly of Brāhmaṇas raised to the throne a member of their own order named Yaśaskara. The line of Yaśaskara was followed by that of Parva Gupta. In the time of Kshema Gupta, son and successor of Parva Gupta, the virtual ruler was his queen Diddā, daughter of a chief of Lohara and descended through her mother from the Shāhis of Udabhāṇḍapura. Diddā, at first, ruled in the name of puppet kings and then seized the crown herself. She kept it till A.D. 1003 when she transmitted her sceptre to her nephew Saṃgrāmarāja, the founder of the Lohara dynasty. A terrible invader now appeared on the scene. The Shāhi kingdom of Udabhāṇḍapura fell after a heroic struggle, in spite of the assistance it received from the ruler of Kāshmīr. The kingdom of Saṃgrāmarāja fortunately escaped destruction at the hands of Mahmud of Ghaznī, but it was too much weakened by internal conflicts to interfere successfully in the general affairs of Northern India. It gradually sank to the position of a minor power and finally succumbed to the Muslims in A.D. 1339.

Bengal and the Pāla Empire

Both under Lalitāditya and Vinayāditya Kāshmir had come into conflict with the arms of Gauḍa, which was the name applied to a people of Western and North-Western Bengal as well as to their country. In the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. this eastern kingdom definitely entered on the scene as a rival of Kanauj and Kāshmīr. References to Gauḍa occur in early literature, notably in the *sūtras* of Pāṇini, the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* and some of the Purāṇas. The sister realm of Vaṅga or Eastern and Central Bengal does not seem to be less ancient as it is referred to in the *Dharmasūtras* and the epic. In the days of Maurya and Gupta ascendancy Bengal seems to have formed part of the empire of Magadha, the eastern districts enjoying a certain amount of autonomy.



COIN ATTRIBUTED TO SAMĀCHĀRADEVA

After the fall of the Imperial Guptas we find several local rulers, notably Dharmāditya, Gopachandra and Samāchāradeva, asserting their independence. Gopachandra was a powerful ruler whose dominions embraced large tracts in both Eastern and Western Bengal. In his days, or those of his immediate successors, the Gauḍa people emerge as a great military power. Sometime before A.D. 554 they came into conflict with Īśānavarman Maukhari and found a safe refuge in a maritime region. In the next century we find them in possession of the aggressive kingdom of Karṇasuvarṇa (in the Murshidabad district). Under the leadership of their king Śaśāṅka they waged war on the aspiring house of Pushyabhūti. The murder of Rājyavardhana and the war of revenge undertaken by his brother and successor Harsha have been mentioned above. Till 619 the power of the Gauḍa king seems to have remained unshaken, and his suzerainty was acknowledged as far south as Gañjām. But sometime between 619 and 637 Śaśāṅka seems to have died and some years later we find the capital city in the possession of Bhāskaravarman of Kāmarūpa, the eastern ally of Harsha. In the latter half of the seventh century eastern India seems, according to some scholars, to have been shared between

the "later Guptas" of Magadha and the Khaḍga dynasty of Eastern Bengal. The Khaḍga chronology is, however, still uncertain. Early in the eighth century both Western and Eastern Bengal were overrun by Yaśovarman of Kanauj. Other conquerors followed in his wake. There was anarchy (*Mātsya nyāya*) in the realm till at last the different sections of the people (*prakṛitis*) raised to the throne a chief named Gopāla, who brought the blessings of peace to the distracted lands.

With Gopāla began the famous Pāla dynasty which, in the last days of its rule, claimed descent from the solar race and also from the sea. Under Pāla rule Bengal was to enjoy a period of prosperity undreamt of in her early annals. In contemporary records the earliest kings of the line are called *Vaṅgapati* and *Gauḍeśvara*, showing that they ruled over the twin kingdoms of Eastern and Western Bengal.

Dharmapāla, son of Gopāla, was one of the greatest kings that ever ruled in Bengal. His accession to the throne probably took place about 780 A.D. In the course of a long reign of at least thirty-two years he raised Bengal to the position of the premier state in Northern India, and did much to restore the greatness of the old imperial city of Pāṭaliputra. He doubtless attempted to shift the political centre of gravity once more to the east, the home territory of the Imperial Mauryas and the great Guptas. He defeated Indrarāja and other enemies, conquered Kanauj and, with the assent of the neighbouring powers, placed on the throne his *protégé* Chakrāyudha. Some records describe him as the conqueror of the whole country from the Himālayas in the north to Gokarṇa in the south. But his successes in the Gangetic Doāb were short-lived. The Rāshṭrakūṭas of the Deccan claim to have expelled the Gauḍa king from the territory between the Ganges and the Jumnā during the period A.D. 772 to 794, while the Pratihāras of Western India under Nāgabhaṭa II drove away Chakrāyudha, the vassal king of Kanauj, and made themselves masters of the imperial seat of Harsha certainly before A.D. 836 and probably before even 833.

The death of Dharmapāla probably took place sometime about A.D. 815. His son and successor Devapāla was equally ambitious. He renewed the struggle with the Gurjaras or the Pratihāras of the west and the Dravidians of the south, and his troops claimed victories not only over the neighbouring realms of Orissa and Assam but also over the Huns, a people whom it was the policy of every aspirant for imperial dominion in Northern India to try to overcome. His court poet credits him with having enjoyed the whole earth from the Himālayas to Adam's Bridge. A more modest claim is put

forward in other epigraphic passages which say that his arms reached the Kamboja territory in the north and the Vindhya hills in the south. That he maintained some sort of relations with the north-west borderland of India appears probable from his connection with Vīradeva, a Brāhamaṇa from Nagarahāra or Jalalābād, who got the important post of abbot of Nālandā in South Bihār. He also received an embassy from Bālaputradeva, ruler of Suvarṇadvīpa or Sumatra (p. 212). He seems to have preferred Monghyr to Pāṭaliputra as the seat of his "camp of victory". He died about A.D. 855 after a reign of at least thirty-nine years, having raised the kingdom of Bengal to a pinnacle of glory that was never again attained in the time of his successors.

After Devapāla the Pāla power seems to have declined. The next king Vigrahapāla I, nephew of Devapāla, was a weak ruler given to religious activities who finally abdicated in favour of his son Nārāyaṇapāla. The "camp of victory" at Monghyr was still in existence in the seventeenth year of Nārāyaṇapāla, about A.D. 880. After this the famous fort does not find any mention in any Pāla record. A Pratihāra record of 837 tells us that a chieftain named Kakka gained renown by fighting with the Gauḍas at Monghyr. It is not improbable that Pāṭaliputra and Monghyr fell before the advancing arms of the Pratihāras. Within a short time, not later than A.D. 898, even Northern Bengal was annexed to the Pratihāra empire. Part of the lost ground seems to have been recovered in the latter part of Nārāyaṇapāla's reign, which extended over more than half a century (at least fifty-four years). Two or three generations later, in the time of Gopāla II or of Vigrahapāla II, the Pāla power was once more shaken, possibly by the Kambojas, but the fortunes of the family were restored by Mahīpāla I. Mahīpāla is known to have been ruling in the first quarter of the eleventh century A.D.

Mahīpāla I is referred to as the overlord of Gauḍa in a record of A.D. 1026. Parts of Bengal had fallen into the hands of local dynasties which may in some cases have acknowledged in a vague way the suzerainty of the Pāla emperor (*adhipa*). Two of the local families, namely, the Śūras of South-West Bengal and the Chandras of Eastern Bengal, deserve special mention. Śūra princes find mention in literature and inscriptions. The most notable among them is Ādiśūra, a name famous in Bengali legend. In the absence of contemporary records it is difficult to say if he can be regarded as an historical figure.

In or about A.D. 1023 the princes of Bengal had to bear the brunt of an attack from Rājendra Chola I, the ambitious ruler

of the Tamil country in the far south of India. The army of Rājendra claims to have measured swords with Ranaśūra of South-West Bengal and Govindachandra of the eastern part of the province. He is also credited with having won a victory over Mahīpāla. Another invader of Mahīpāla's dominions was in the opinion of some scholars the famous Gāngeyadeva Kalachuri, but this view rests on an identification which may be doubted.

ATĪSA
(Reproduced from L. A. Waddell's "Buddhism of Tibet". Heffer)

After Mahīpāla came his son Nayapāla and grandson Vigrahapāla III. Both these personages came into conflict with Karṇa Kalachuri, the great king of the Chedi country in Central India. Vigraha III married Yauvanaśrī, daughter of the Chedi king. Another queen of this monarch was of Rāshṭrakūṭa lineage. He left three sons, Mahīpāla II, Surapāla, and Rāmapāla. Mahīpāla II proved to be a weak king. The Pāla empire now depended in large measure on the support of a military aristocracy recruited in part from other provinces. A confederacy of indigenous chieftains revolted against the king. Divvoka, a Kaivarta, held sway in North Bengal which was temporarily lost to the Pālas. Sometime after Divvoka his nephew Bhīma became king. The latter was overthrown by Rāmapāla, the youngest brother of Mahīpāla II, mainly with the help of his Rāshṭrakūṭa relations. The new king once more restored the fortunes of his family. Rāmapāla was followed by his son Kumārapāla, a grandson, Gopāla III, and a second son Madanapāla. In the end Pāla supremacy in Bengal was destroyed by Vijayasena, who belonged to a family that came from the Kanarese country

in the Deccan. The Sena power was firmly established in almost the whole of Bengal by the middle of the twelfth century A.D.

The Pāla dynasty produced the last great Hindu emperor whose commands were issued from the historic city of Pātaliputra. Like the Mauryas and the Guptas, the Pāla sovereigns raised a kingdom in Eastern India to a position of pre-eminence in *Āryāvarta*. Like their illustrious predecessors they maintained relations with the distant potentates of the world as known to them, and not only did much to foster religion and culture in India but encouraged their spread to foreign lands. The Pāla period saw the foundation of the Universities of Uddandapura and Vikramaśīla. The epoch was rendered memorable by the activities of artists like Dhīmāna and Vītapāla, of missionaries like Pandit Dharmapāla and Atīsa Dīpaṅkara and scholars like Chakrapāṇi and Sandhyākara. Themselves devoted worshippers of Buddha, the Pāla monarchs were catholic enough to grant toleration to the votaries of Nārāyana and Mahādeva. Throughout the Pāla period the king sought the assistance of Brāhmaṇa ministers. The rise of Kaivarta chiefs to positions of power and wealth in the latter days of the dynasty shows that careers were open to men of talent irrespective of caste and creed.

The Pratihāra Empire

The Pālas were one of the most long-lived dynasties of Indian history, but their supremacy in the Gangetic Doāb was of short duration. The sceptre of Kanauj was not long wielded by the vassals of Dharmapāla, and by A.D. 836 the Pratihāra dynasty was firmly established in the city of Mahodaya (Kanauj). Before the end of the ninth century the power of this new imperial line had extended in all directions and the command of the great Pratihāra king was obeyed all over the wide expanse of territory stretching from Pehoa in the Punjab to Deogarh in Central India, and from Una in Kāthiāwār to Pāhārpur in North Bengal.

In their epigraphic records the Pratihāras claim descent from the Kshatriya Lakshmaṇa (brother of Rāma) of the solar race famed in the *Rāmāyana*, and also from a Brāhmana named Harichandra. The prevailing view among modern scholars is that they are a branch of the Gurjara race that began to play an important part in Indian history from the sixth century A.D. The Gurjaras established principalities in the Punjab, Marwar and Broach. In the seventh century A.D. they find mention in the *Harsha-charita* of Bāṇa, the records of Hiuen Tsang and the Aihole inscription of Pulakeśin II. About the middle of the eighth century A.D.

certain Gurjara chiefs are represented as serving a Rāshṭrakūṭa monarch as Pratihāra (door-keeper) at a sacrifice performed at Ujjain. The designation Pratihāra probably originated in this way, though a later tradition connects it with Lakshmaṇa, brother of Rāma, who guarded the doors of the latter on a memorable occasion. The connection of the Pratihāra family of Kanauj with Avanti, the district round Ujjain, at some stage in the progress of their power does not seem to be improbable in view of the alleged statement of the Jaina *Harivaṁśa* that Vatsarāja, a distinguished member of the line, was a ruler of Avanti. A different interpretation of the passage in question is, however, suggested by some scholars. The founder of Vatsarāja's family was Nāgabhaṭa I who is usually assigned to the middle of the eighth century A.D. He did much to rehabilitate the power of the Gurjaras which was threatened by the Arabs from Sind and the Chālukyas and the Rāshṭrakūṭas from the Deccan. Vatsarāja, grand-nephew of Nāgabhaṭa I, claims to have won the position of *Samrāj*, or emperor, and extended his conquests as far as Bengal, but he was driven to the trackless wilderness by the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Dhruva of the Deccan. His son Nāgabhaṭa II won some successes at first. He is credited with having extended his influence from Sind in the north to the Andhra country in the south, from Ānartta in Kāṭhiāwār in the west to the borders of Bengal in the east. His most notable achievement was the defeat of Dharmapāla, king of Bengal, and the expulsion of his *protégé* Chakrāyudha from Kanauj. But he himself sustained defeats at the hands of the Rāshṭrakūṭas, the sworn enemies of his line, who had grown very powerful under the vigorous rule of Govinda III.

The Pratihāra power recovered under Bhoja I, grandson of Nāgabhaṭa II, who was firmly enthroned at Kanauj in A.D. 836. He extended his power northwards as far as Pehoa and southwards as far as the Vindhyas, but his further progress was stopped by Śaṅkaravarman of Kāshmīr and Dhruva Dhārāvarsha, a Rāshṭrakūṭa chieftain of Broach. He was more successful in the east. The Gauḍas (of Bengal) were defeated and the Pratihāra empire in the time of his successor stretched as far as Pāhārpur in North Bengal. The empire of Bhoja was visited by the merchant Sulaimān who spoke highly of the strength of his cavalry and of the peace that reigned in his kingdom.

Mahendrapāla I, son of Bhoja, maintained his father's empire and seems to have extended it towards the east. He imitated Harsha and Yaśovarman in encouraging learning. His court was adorned by the poet Rājaśekhara.

Mahendra was followed by his sons Mahipāla, Bhoja II and Vināyakapāla. Some scholars prefer to identify Mahīpāla Pratihāra with Vināyakapāla, but their dates do not overlap. Mahīpāla maintained his hold on Surāshṭra or Kāṭhiāwār as late as 914 A.D. In the next year Al Masūdī visited his realm and spoke about his horses and camels. In 917 the Pratihāra king was still in possession of the Gangetic Doāb. Rājaśekhara speaks about his conquests in the most distant regions of India from Kulūta in the north to Kerala in the south. His power was threatened by Indra III, the Rāshṭrakūṭa king of the Deccan, who inflicted a severe defeat on him and took Kanauj. Mahīpāla seems to have been restored by a Chandella king. The dramatist Kshemīśvara asserts in his *Chaṇḍakauśika*, which he wrote for the Pratihāra king, his patron's triumph over the Karṇātas, i.e. the Rāshṭrakūṭas. But the Pratihāra empire does not seem to have fully recovered from the blow it received at the hands of the latter.

The succeeding rulers maintained a precarious hold over the upper Ganges valley, parts of Rājputāna and Mālwa, but their former feudatories, notably the Chandellas, aggrandised themselves at their cost. The Chālukyas made themselves independent in Gujarāt, the Paramāras in Mālwa, the Chandellas and Chedis in the country between the Jumnā and the Nerbudda. A still more formidable enemy appeared on the scene early in the eleventh century A.D. In 1018 Kanauj, then ruled by Rājyapāla Pratihāra, was taken by Mahmūd of Ghaznī. The Pratihāra dynasty probably continued to rule over a small territory till the second quarter of the eleventh century A.D. But their empire was gone and they sank to the position of local chieftains.

The Shāhiyas

The Pratihāras in the days of their greatness had defended Hindustān against the Arab invaders. Towards the end of the tenth century the task of defending the north-western frontier of India devolved on another dynasty, the Shāhiyas. The origin of this dynasty which played such an important role in Indian history may be briefly told. A family of Indianized foreigners had been ruling for a long time in the Kabul valley and adjoining regions to the east as far as the Indus. Al-Biruni calls them descendants of Kanishka and they are known as Turkish Shāhiyas. About the middle of the ninth century A.D. king Lagatūrmān of this dynasty was dethroned by his Brāhmaṇa minister named Kallār who has been identified with Lalliya Shāhi, highly praised in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*. He and his

successors are known as Hindu or Brāhmaṇa Shāhiyas or Shāhis. Their capital, Kabul, being seized by the Suffarid Yaqub in 870 A.D., they shifted it to Udabhāṇḍapura or Ohind (modern Und), a small village on the right bank of the Sindhu, about fifteen miles above Attock. The Hindu Shāhiya kings had political and matrimonial relations with the rulers of Kashmir. The famous queen of this kingdom, Diddā, was the daughter's daughter of the *Mahārājādhirāja Parameśvara* Sāhi Śrī-Bhīmadeva. The next important king of this dynasty was Jayapāla (or Jaipāl) who also assumed imperial titles and ruled over an extensive kingdom stretching from Lamghān in Eastern Afghanistan to Sirhind in the Punjab in the east and Multan in the south. The history of this king will be related in Chapter XIII.

CHAPTER XII

THE DECCAN FROM THE FALL OF THE SĀTAVĀHANAS TO THE END OF RĀSHTRAKŪṬA SUPREMACY—RISE OF THE EMPIRES OF KĀÑCHĪ AND KARṆĀṬA

Successors of the Sātavāhanas

GAUTAMĪPUTRA ŚRĪ YAJÑA ŚĀTAKARṆI, who probably ruled towards the close of the second century A.D., was the last great king of his house. After his death, the Sātavāhana empire began to fall to pieces. The Nāsik region in Mahārāshṭra seems to have been lost to the Ābhīra king Īśvarasena. The Vākāṭakas rose to power in Berar and some adjoining tracts. The Western Kanarese districts fell into the hands of a line of Śātakarṇis who received the epithet of Chutukulānanda and are sometimes referred to as Chutu-Śātakarṇis to distinguish them from the Sātavāhana Śātakarṇis of the Imperial line. They had their capital at the famous city of Vaijayantīpura or Banavāsi in north Kanara. The old imperial line continued to rule for some time longer in the Andhra country at the mouth of the Krishnā till they were supplanted by the Ikshvākus, the rulers belonging to the Ānanda *gotra*, the Bṛihatphalāyanas, and the Śālaṅkāyanas, who were succeeded by the Vishnukundins. The Śālaṅkāyanas already ruled as petty chieftains as early as the second century A.D. They must have asserted their independence shortly after the fall of the Imperial Sātavāhanas. They came into conflict with the northern emperor Samudra Gupta in the fourth century A.D. Meanwhile another power had arisen in the far south of India with its capital at Kāñchī, modern Conjeeveram near Madras, but exercising control over some of the Kanarese districts and the southern part of the Andhra country at the mouth of the river Kṛishnā. This was the Pallava power. At the time of the famous raid of Samudra Gupta, the most important dynasties in trans-Vindhyan India were the Vākāṭakas of the Upper Deccan and the Pallavas of Kāñchī. The Gupta conqueror does not appear to have come into direct contact with the Vākāṭakas. He vanquished, however, a chief named Vyāghrarāja, who may have been identical with a Vākāṭaka feudatory named Vyāghradeva. Chandra Gupta II, the son and

successor of Samudra Gupta, on the other hand, established direct relations with his Vākāṭaka neighbours and gave his daughter Prabhāvatī in marriage to their king Rudrasena II. The Vākāṭakas in their turn were linked by matrimonial alliances with several dynasties beyond the Godāvarī. The descendants of Rudrasena II and Prabhāvatī continued to rule in the Deccan for several generations till the rise of the Vishṇukuṇḍins and their rivals and contemporaries, the Chālukyas of Vātāpi and the Kaṭachchuris or Kalachuris of Nāsik and Mālwa.

The Great Pallavas

To the south of the Vākāṭakas lay the realm of the Pallavas of Kāñchī, one of whose early kings, Vishṇugopa, was captured and then liberated by Samudra Gupta about the middle of the fourth century A.D. The name Vishṇugopa was borne by several members of the Pallava dynasty, and it is not known in what relationship the contemporary of Samudra Gupta stood to the famous Śivaskandavarman who is mentioned in the early Prākrit records of the family as a "righteous king of great kings" and the performer of the horse-sacrifice. Inscriptions mention the names of several later Pallava monarchs whose dominions embraced not only Kāñchī but considerable parts of the Telugu and Kanarese districts. The suzerainty of some of them was acknowledged by the early Gangas of eastern and southern Mysore and the early Kadambas who supplanted the Chutu-Śātakarṇis of Vaijayantī. We learn from the *Lokavibhāga* that one of the Pallava kings who bore the name of Siṁhavarman ascended the throne in A.D. 436.

The history of the family becomes more definite from the time of Siṁhavishṇu, who must have come to the throne in the latter half of the sixth century A.D. This king is credited with having seized the country of the Cholas and vanquished all his southern neighbours, including the ruler of Ceylon. The conquest of Ceylon is also mentioned as an achievement of his grandson Narasiṁhavarman. Siṁhavishṇu was a Vaishṇava, and magnificent reliefs representing the king and two of his consorts have been discovered in the Varāha cave at Māmallapuram.

The successor of Siṁhavishṇu was his son, Mahendravarman I, whose reign saw the beginning of the great struggle between the Pallavas and their northern enemies the Chālukyas of Vātāpi for the mastery of Southern India. The struggle was continued for several generations. The Chālukya king. Pulakeśin II, is said to have caused the splendour of the Pallava lords to be obscured

by the dust of his army and to vanish behind the walls of Kāñchīpura. On the other hand, Narasiṁhavarman I, son and successor of Mahendravarman, is said to have vanquished Pulakeśin in many battles and stormed his capital, Vātāpi. The struggle was renewed by Vikramāditya I, son of Pulakeśin II, who claims to have caused the destruction of the family of Narasiṁha and captured the city of Kāñchī. The Pallava records, however, inform us that the Chālukya attack was finally repulsed. Undaunted by their failures, the Chālukyas once more overran the Pallava dominions under the leadership of Vikramāditya II, great-grandson of Vikramāditya I,

(Copyright Klein and Peyerl)

RATHAS AT MĀMALLAPURAM

in the first half of the eighth century A.D. They routed King Nandivarman Pallavamalla and took the city of Kāñchī. The Pallavas were now threatened by enemies from the south as well as the north. The Pāṇḍyas advanced up to the banks of the Kāverī and engaged in deadly conflicts with the decadent empire of Kāñchī. The *coup de grâce* was given by Āditya Chola who defeated Aparājita Pallava and took possession of his kingdom towards the end of the ninth century A.D.

The epoch of the Pallavas of Kāñchī is memorable in the political

and cultural history of India. They built up the first great empire south of the Penner and the Tuṅgabhadrā, and carried their arms as far as Ceylon. Many of the Vaishṇava Ālvārs and the Śaiva Nāyanārs (saints) flourished during their rule. Under them Kāñchī became a great centre of Brāhmaṇical as well as Buddhist learning. Mahendravarman I, who bore the significant epithet of *Vichitra-chitta*, "curious-minded", introduced the cave style of architecture and wrote the famous burlesque known as the *Mattavilāsa-prahasana*. The Pallava painting discovered in a cave shrine in the Pudukottai State has also been assigned to his reign. His son Narasiṁhavarman Mahāmalla gave his name to the port of Māmallapuram, and some of the famous temples cut out of rock boulders known as *Rathas* situated in that spot are ascribed to his reign. A later king, Narasiṁhavarman II, surnamed Rājasiṁha, constructed the Kailāsanatha temple at Kāñchī.

The Early Chālukyas

The Chālukyas, sworn enemies of the Pallavas of Kāñchī, rose to power in Karṇāṭa or the Kanarese-speaking country in the sixth century A.D., and had their first capital at Vātāpi, modern Bādāmi in the Bijāpur district of the Bombay Presidency. Like the Chuṭu-Śātakarṇis and the Kadambas of Vaijayantī, they are represented as belonging to the Mānavya *gotra* and being Haritī-putras. In later times they claimed descent from the lunar race. Certain inscriptions of a branch of the family refer their origin to Ayodhyā, and one tradition connects the dynastic name with Brahmadeva's *Chuluka* or hand hollowed out for the reception of water. Some writers believe that the Chālukyas were in reality connected with the Chāpas and the foreign Gurjara tribes of the north, but there is very little to be said in support of this conjecture. Inscriptions distinguish between Chālukyas and Gurjaras, and the characteristic nomenclature of the line is distinctly southern.

The real founder of the dynasty of Vātāpi was Pulakeśin I, who signalised his accession to power by the performance of the horse-sacrifice. His sons, Kīrtivarman I and Maṅgaleśa, extended the empire in all directions and vanquished the neighbouring rulers, including the Mauryas of the Konkan, the Kadambas of Vaijayantī and the Kalachuris of northern Mahārāshṭra and Mālwa. The Kadamba capital was finally reduced by Pulakeśin II, son of Kīrtivarman, the most famous king of the line. In the course of a long reign extending from about A.D. 609 to 642, Pulakeśin II

not only consolidated his authority in Mahārāshṭra but overran nearly the whole of the Deccan from the banks of the Nerbudda to the region beyond the Kāverī, thus reviving the memory of the glorious days of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi. He repulsed an attack by Harsha of Kanauj and claims to have humbled the pride of Mahendravarman of Kāñchī. He annexed Pishṭapura in the Godāvarī district, the government of which was entrusted to his younger brother, Kubja Vishṇuvardhana. Hiuen Tsang, who visited his kingdom about A.D. 641, bears testimony to the fear inspired by the king and the stern vindictive character of his people. According to some authorities, he interchanged letters and presents with the king of Persia, but the matter is not free from doubt. The last days of the king were not happy. The Pallava king, Narasiṁhavarman I, son and successor of Mahendravarman I, retrieved the disasters of his father's reign, inflicting crushing defeats on Pulakeśin and destroying his capital, Vātāpi.

The Chālukya power was revived by Vikramāditya I, son of Pulakeśin II, who renewed the struggle against his southern enemies. His exploits were emulated and even surpassed by his great-grandson, Vikramāditya II, who actually entered the Pallava capital. A feudatory Chālukya chieftain, belonging to a junior branch of the royal line stationed in South Gujarāt, distinguished himself in a struggle with the formidable Tājikas, who are identified with the Arabs of Sind. In or about 753, the son and successor of Vikramāditya II was overthrown by a chief named Dantidurga who laid the foundation of the next great empire of Karṇāṭa and Mahārāshṭra, that of the Rāshtrakūtas.

The Great Rāshṭrakūṭas

The Rāshṭrakūṭas in their later records claim descent from Sātyaki, a Yādava chief of the north, a close associate of Kṛishṇa, famed in epic tradition. Some scholars connect them with the Telugu Reḍḍis. Others regard them as the main branch of a race of *Kshatriyas* who gave their name to the country of Mahārāshṭra and already figured as rulers in the days of Aśoka. Another theory traces their origin to hereditary officials in charge of *Rāshṭras* or provinces. In several Chālukya records of the eastern Deccan, Rāshṭrakūṭas are often referred to as *Kutumbins* or agriculturists in the Andhra country. They are also connected with the Kanarese region, and their own records speak of them as hereditary chiefs of Laṭṭalur, identified with Latur in the Nizām's dominions. It is not improbable that the Rāshtrakūṭas were originally Dravidian

agriculturists who obtained hereditary governorships of provinces under the Chālukyas, and then established an empire, as the Marātha Deshmukhs, who served under the Muslim Sultāns of Ahmadnagar and Bijapur, did in a later age.

The Rāshṭrakūṭas established an empire which in the days of its greatness extended from South Gujarāt, Mālwa and Bāghelkhand in the north to Tanjore in the south. Their predecessors, the Chālukyas, had simply repulsed an attack of an emperor of Kanauj. The Rāshṭrakūṭas, on the other hand, penetrated into the Gangetic Doāb and claim to have stormed the imperial seat of Mahīpāla Pratihāra,—the grandson of Bhoja I of Kanauj. In the Eastern Deccan, however, their dominions did not include the whole of the district at the mouths of the Godāvarī and the Kṛishnā. The latter continued to be ruled by a junior branch of the Chālukya family. The pre-eminence of the Rāshṭrakūtas among the rulers of the age is testified to by Arab writers who refer to the *Balhara* (*Vallabharāja*) or beloved prince of Mankir, i.e. the Rāshṭrakūṭa monarch of Mānyakheṭa or Malkheḍ, as one of the four great sovereigns of the world, entitled to rank with the sovereign of China, the Caliph of Bagdad and the emperor of Constantinople.

The Rāshṭrakūṭas were patrons of learning, and one king, Amoghavarsha I, was an author of repute. They were also great builders, and their second king, Kṛishṇa I, uncle of Dantidurga, executed the famous Kailāsa temple at Ellora. The chief interest of Rāshṭrakūṭa history in the days of Krishṇa I's successors centres round the struggle with the Pratihāras of Kanauj, as that of the Chālukyas of Vātāpi centred round the conflict with the Pallavas of Kāñchī. Dhruva, younger son of Kṛishṇa I, defeated Vatsarāja Pratihāra and expelled a Gauḍa king, probably Dharmapāla, from the Gangetic Doāb. Under Govinda III, son and successor of Dhruva, the Rāshṭrakūṭas verily became invincible. They exacted tribute from the Pallavas of Kāñchī and installed one of their princes on the throne of South Gujarāt. Nāgabhaṭa II, son of Vatsarāja, sustained defeats at their hands. Dharmapāla of Bengal and his vassal, Chakrāyudha, are said to have offered their submission. The next king, Amoghavarsha I, had a very long reign (about A.D. 815–877). He removed his capital to Mānyakheṭa or Malkhed in the Nizām's dominions. He could not successfully emulate his father's exploits in the far north as he was involved in a struggle with the Chālukyas of Vengī at the mouths of the Godāvarī and the Kṛishṇā. But the Rāshṭrakūtas in his time succeeded in checking the southern progress of Bhoja I of Kanauj. He also attached the more important rulers of the far south to the

Rāshṭrakūṭa interest by marriage alliances. Indra III, great-grandson of Amoghavarsha I, finished the work of his illustrious ancestors, Dhruva and Govinda III, by inflicting a crushing defeat on Mahīpāla, the Pratihāra king of Kanauj, and taking temporary possession of his capital city. His nephew, Kṛishṇa III, was the last great king of the line. His dominions extended from Jura in Bāghelkhand to Tanjore in the Kāverī valley. In 973, the Rāshṭrakūṭa dynasty was overthrown by Taila II, a feudatory of Kṛishṇa III, who claimed descent from the early Chālukyas of Vātāpi.

The Later Chālukyas

Taila was the founder of the Chālukya dynasty of Kalyāṇa or Kalyāṇi in the Nizām's dominions. His successors became involved in a contest with the Cholas of Tanjore, descendants of king Āditya who had crushed the Pallava king Aparājita. The Cholas now fast rose to power under Rājarāja and his son, Rājendra Chola I. While the Cholas and Chālukyas were engaged in bitter feuds in the south, thrones and dynasties in Northern India were falling before the onslaught of the famous *Hammīra*, Sultan Mahmūd of Ghaznī or Ghazna. The banner of Islam was unfurled in the Land of the Five Rivers and the Valley of the Twin Rivers, the Upper Ganges and the Jumnā. The arms of the Ghaznavid invader penetrated into the interior of Kāṭhiāwār and reached the temple of Somnāth. Indian history enters on a new epoch.

CHAPTER XIII

THE PASSING OF THE OLD HINDU KINGDOMS

The Coming of the Arabs

In the western part of Asia lies a vast country called Arabia, a land of rocks and deserts with a few oases and fertile valleys, thinly peopled by a hardy and sturdy folk. In this country, at a short distance from the western sea coast, stands the holy city of Mecca—where sometime in the year 570 was born the great Prophet, the founder of a religion that preached the unity of God, and roused the people to energy and unbounded enthusiasm. Under the successors of the Prophet, called Khalifas or Caliphs, who led the Faithful from A.D. 632, the arms of the Moslems advanced in all directions, and the banner of Islam floated over many countries from Irān to Spain. From the beginning the Arabs had their eyes on the rich ports of Western India and the outlying parts of the north-west borderland. As early as the time of the great Pulakeśin II, an army was sent to Thana near Bombay (*c.* A.D. 637). This was followed by expeditions to Broach, the Gulf of Debal (in Sind), and Al-Kikan (the district round Kelāt). About the middle of the seventh century, the satrapy of Zaranj in Southern Afghānistān fell into the hands of the Arabs. The turn of Makrān in Baluchistān came next. The Arabs now made repeated onslaughts on the Shāh of Kābul, supposed to be a descendant of the great Kanishka, and the *Ratbil* of Zābul in the upper valley of the Helmund river and some adjoining districts. The latter succumbed after a brave struggle (A.D. 870). The Turkī Shāhīya kings of Kābul maintained a precarious existence till the closing years of the ninth century when they were supplanted by Kallār, usually identified with Lalliya, the founder of the Hindu Shāhīya dynasty of Udabhāṇḍapura (Waihand, Ohind or Und on the Indus).

Meanwhile, the Arabs had followed up their success in Baluchistān by the conquest of Sind. That province figures in the narrative of Bāṇa as one of the territories overrun by Prabhākaravardhana and his more famous son, Harsha. In the days of Hiuen Tsang the throne was occupied by a Śūdra dynasty which gave way to

a Brāhmaṇa family founded by Chach. Dāhar or Dāhir, son of Chach, was on the throne when al-Hajjaj, governor of Irāk, incensed at the action of certain pirates of Debal, sent several expeditions to Sind. The earlier incursions were repulsed by Dāhir. Thereupon al-Hajjaj entrusted the work of punishing the Indian king to his nephew and son-in-law, Muhammad ibn-Kāsīm. The young commander stormed Debal, captured Nerun and some other cities and strongholds, and pushed on to the western bank of the Indus. His work was greatly facilitated by the treachery of certain Buddhist priests and renegade chiefs who deserted their sovereign and joined the invader. With the assistance of some of these traitors, Muhammad crossed the vast sheet of water separating his army from that of Dāhir and gave battle to the Indian ruler near Raor (A.D. 712). Dāhir offered a brave resistance, but was defeated and killed. The fort of Raor fell next after a heroic defence by the widowed queen. The invaders now pushed on to Bahmanābād and Alor, which submitted. The turn of Multān came next. The whole of the lower Indus valley was now dominated by the Arabs. But the invaders had no mind to stop there. Already in the time of Muhammad ibn-Kāsīm minor operations were carried on in the neighbouring provinces. A later governor, Junaid or Junayd, pursued a more aggressive policy and sent expeditions against Marmad (Marwar ?), al-Mandal (Mandor ? near Viramgam ?), Dahnaj, Barwas (Broach), Ujjain, Malibah (Mālwa), Baharimad, al-Bailaman (Vallamaṇḍala ?) and al-Jurz (Gurjara). According to Indian inscriptions, the territories overrun by the invaders included Sind, Cutch, Surāshṭra or Kāṭhiāwār, Chavoṭaka (some Chāpa principality of Gujarāt or Western Rājputāna), a Maurya principality apparently in southern Rājputāna or Mālwa, and the Gurjjara territory apparently round Bhinmal or Broach. The progress of the Arabs was stopped by the Chālukyas in the south, the Pratihāras in the east, and the Kārkoṭas in the north. But a new scene opened with the foundation of the kingdom of Ghaznī by Alptigīn in or about A.D. 962.

Fall of the Shāhiya Dynasty of Udabhāṇḍa

Alptigīn was formerly a slave of the Samanid rulers of Central Asia. This enterprising chief made himself independent in Ghaznī and conquered a part of the kingdom of Kābul. He died in A.D. 963. In A.D. 977 his sceptre passed into the hands of his son-in-law, Sabuktigīn. He encroached on the dominions of the Shāhiya ruler Jayapāla to whom reference has been made above. In order to put a stop to the depredations of Sabuktigīn, Jayapāla advanced towards

Ghaznī and met his enemy near a place called Ghūzak between Ghaznī and Lamghan. A snow-storm compelled Jayapāla to conclude a humiliating peace, but he soon broke his engagements and brought on his head the wrath of the Sultān. The latter carried fire and sword into the territory of his antagonist and seized the districts in the neighbourhood of Lamghan. In 997 Sabuktigīn died, and in the next year the crown went to his famous son, Mahmud. In 1001 the new Sultān inflicted a crushing defeat on Jayapāla near the city of Peshāwār. Unable to survive this disgrace, the defeated king burnt himself on a funeral pyre and was succeeded by his son, Ānandapāla (A.D. 1002 or 1003). In 1006 Mahmud took Multān, but the final subjugation of the city was postponed till 1010. In 1008 he routed the troops of Ānandapāla, led by prince Brāhmaṇapāla, at the battle of Waihand, and pursued the fugitives as far as Bhimnagar.

Ānandapāla continued to offer resistance from the fastnesses of the Salt Range (Nandana). His successor, Trilochanpāla, carried on the struggle with the assistance of Saṃgrāmarāja of Kāshmīr. In the end he was compelled to retire to the east and conclude an alliance with the Chandella ruler of Kālinjar and other princes of Mid-India. But he was again defeated on the river Ruhut (Rāhib) identified by some with the Rāmgaṅgā. He was assassinated in A.D. 1021–1022. With the death of his son and successor, Bhīma, in 1026 the dynasty came to an end. Both al-Biruni and Kalhaṇa bear testimony to the courage and magnanimity of this noble line of kings who poured out their blood like water in defending the north-western gates of their country against the invader.

Mahmud did not remain content with the laurels he won in the Punjab. In 1014 he took Thānesar, and in the following years made an unsuccessful attempt to conquer the vale of Kāshmīr. He also burnt the temple of Mathurā. In 1018 he sacked Kanauj and extinguished the once powerful empire of the Pratihāras. In 1022–1023 he received the submission of Gwālior and Kālinjar. His most famous expedition, that against Somnāth in Kāṭhiāwār, was undertaken in 1025. The fall of the most celebrated Hindu shrine of the age in 1026 synchronised with the extinction of the Hindu Shāhiya kingdom of the Punjab. Four years later the Sultān died.

Mahmud's expeditions were mostly regular raids undertaken mainly with the object of destroying Hindu temples, desecrating Hindu idols and plundering the wealth of the country. Altogether seventeen expeditions are set to his credit by Muslim chroniclers who describe with glee the wanton destruction and massacre on a

large scale by Mahmud and the fabulous wealth carried by him to Ghaznī after each expedition. It is said that from Nagarkot alone he plundered "700,000 golden dināars, 700 *mans* of gold and silver plates, 200 *mans* of pure gold in ingots, 2,000 *mans* of unwrought silver, and twenty *mans* of various jewels, including pearls, corals, diamonds and rubies."

The only permanent results of his arduous campaigns were the annexation of the Hindu Shāhiya kingdom and certain other districts in the Punjab and the north-west borderland and the destruction of the morale of the Hindu armies. The raids of Mahmud must have made a profound impression on the minds of the great Rājput powers of Western and Central India that sought to divide among themselves the imperial heritage of the Pratihāras. During the period 1030–1192, that is to say from the death of Mahmud to the arrival on the scene of Muhammad of Ghur, the princes of the Indian interior enjoyed comparative immunity from foreign attacks. The Ghaznavid Sultāns now and then harried certain territories, and on one occasion one of their generals advanced up to Benares and sacked the holy city. But on the whole, the invaders could not make much headway. The terror inspired by their ravages had, however, lasting consequences.

Revival of the Vikramādityan Tradition

The situation in the latter part of the eleventh and first three quarters of the twelfth century was not unlike that in the sixth century A.D. The old empires of the Pratihāras and the Pālas were falling to pieces like the Gupta empire after Buddha Gupta. The task of defending Hindustān fell upon their former feudatories who now set up as independent sovereigns. The fight with the Yamīnī Turks and their successors became as engrossing a subject as the earlier struggle with the Huns. There was a revival of the Vikramādityan tradition, and the example of the great hero who braved a Śaka king in his own city, and that of his famous grandson who beat back the incursions of the Huns and restored an empire after vanquishing the enemies of his family, must have inspired the greater rulers of the new age—kings like Gāṅgeyadeva of Chedi, Sindhurāja of Mālwa, and Tribhuvanamalla of Kalyāṇ, who called themselves Vikramāditya or the new Sāhasāṅka. The new spirit is well illustrated by the execution of the pusillanimous Pratihāra king Rājyapāla by a Kachchapaghāta chief who was "anxious to serve Vidhādharadeva", and the attempt of Tribhuvanamalla Vikramāditya VI to supersede the Śaka era by a

new national reckoning. But the cases of Rājyapāla, the representative of the Imperial Pratihāras, and of Tribhuvanamalla himself who fought against his own brother, are symptomatic of the weakness of the Hindu princes—their internal strife and failure, except on rare occasions, to take concerted action in a time of national crisis. The Hindus of the age, moreover, lacked the invigorating and dynamic influence of a new impulse that was then moving vast masses of mankind in Western and West Central Asia.

Bhīma I, the Chālukya or Solanki king of Gujarāt, had failed to bar the route to the holy shrine of Somnāth. After the invader was gone, he sought to repair the ravages which the Turks had inflicted on the habitations of the gods. He began to build at Somnāth a temple of stone in place of the former temple of brick and wood. His general, Vimala, built the famous Jaina temple at Abu, known as Vimala Vasahi. Other edifices were constructed in the time of the successors of Bhīma, particularly in the days of Siddharāja Jayasimha and Kumārapāla. Two later rulers, Mūlarāja II Solanki and Vīradhavala Vāghela, attained greater success than Bhīma I in repelling the attacks of invaders. Two officers of Vīradhavala, Vastupāla and Tejahpāla, have immortalised their names by the construction of magnificent shrines at Śatruñjaya, Girnār and Abu. In course of time the feelings of hostility roused by Turkish aggression wore off to a certain extent and king Arjuna of Gujarāt had the broadmindedness to endow a mosque erected by a Muslim ship-owner of Ormuz, and provided for the expenses of certain Shiite festivals. He further laid down that under the management of the Muslim community of Somnāth any surplus was to be made over to the holy districts of Mecca and Medina, In 1297, Gujarāt passed into the hands of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn Khalji of Delhi.

The throne of the Paramāras of Mālwa was, in the days of Sabuktigin, occupied by the famous Muñja, a great patron of poets, whose power was crushed by Taila II, the Chālukya king of the Deccan. His brother and successor, Sindhurāja, assumed the significant title of Navasāhasāṅka, that is, the new Sāhasāṅka or Vikramāditya. Bhoja, son and successor of Sindhurāja, claims victories over the Turushkas or Turks. He made his name immortal by his patronage of learning, just as the Gujarāt statesmen did by their temples. A versatile scholar, he wrote treatises on numerous subjects, including poetics, rhetoric, polity, philosophy, astronomy and architecture. He also established a college for Sanskrit studies. The construction of temples and the encouragement of Sanskri-

Ghur
Najarghara (Jalalabad)
SHAHIS
Kabul
Charakh
Ghazni
Gardiz
Kandahar
Pashawar
Und
Poonch
KASHMIR
Srinagar
Lokho
Jhelum
Khewra
Nandana
Bhera
Sakala (Sialkot)
Kangra
(Amritsar)
(Lahore)
Jalandhar
Deohra
(Simla)
R. Jhelum
R. Chenab
R. Ravi
Sutlej
Multan
Bhatinda
Sirsawa
Thanesar
Hardwar
Bhatnair
(Bahawalpur)
Sirsa
Hansi
Meerut
Uchh
TOMARAS
Delhi
Sarawa
Bulandshahr
DUSDAR
R. Indus
(Bikaner)
PRATIHARAS
Rohri
Aror
Ludrava
(Jaisalmer)
Alwar
Bairat
Mathura (Muttra)
Sambhar
Mahoban
(Agra)
(Jaipur)
SINDHAVAS
(Jodhpur)
Chatsu
Etawah
Bahmanabad
CHAUHANAS
Ajmer
R. Chambal
Asaf
Mansura
Ranthambor
Gwalior
PAGHATAS
KACHCHHAPAGHATAS
(Haidarabad)
Nadol
(Jhansi)
Mahoba
CHANDELLAS
(Karachi)
SIND
Bhinmal
Chilor
Kalinj
Nasda
(Udaipur)
Chanderi
Khajuraho
Palanpur
Patan
GUHILOTS OF MEDAPATA
(Saygor)
Cutch
Mundher
(Ahmadabad)
Bhilsa
(Bhopal)
PARAMARAS
KALACHURI CHEDIS
Navanagar
Beyt Shankhodar
CHALUKYAS
Cambay
Ujjain
Dha-
(Indore)
Tewar
(Jubbulpore)
Gandhavi
Porbandar
KATHIAWAR
Wala
Baroda
Mandu
R. Narbada
Girnar Hill
Belvada
Somnath
Diu
R. Tapti
(Nagpur)
Ajanta
Amraoti
Ellora
Nasik
YADAVAS
Deogiri
Salsette I
(Bombay)
SILAHARAS
RASHTRAKUTAS
R. Godavari
Poona
KAKATIYAS
Warangal
ARABIAN
CHALUKYAS
Malkhed
Kahani
Bijapur
Kolhapur
R. Krishna
Srisailam
SEA
KARNATA
R. Tungabhadra
Vijayanagar)
TELINGANA
Banavasi
R. Pennar
HOYSALAS
Tirupati
Sringeri
Dvaravatipur
(Bangalore)
Conjeeveram
(Mangalore)
Belur
Seringapatam
Mamallap
Mysore
Talakad
Salem
Laccadive
Islands
TAMILAKAM
(Calicut)
R. Kaveri
Gangaikonda
(Palghat)
Trichinopoly
Tanjore
CHOLAS
Kolidi
Madura
(Cochin)
PANDYAS
Rameswaram
SIMHALA
70°
80°
30°
20°
10°

EARLY MEDIÆVAL INDIA
Modern names are given in Brackets.
Kilometres
0 100 200 300 400 500 600 700 800
90°
100°
30°
20°
10°
NEPAL
Khatmandu
TIRHUT
KAMARUPA
(Tezpur)
R. Brahmaputra
Kamakhya
VARENDRI
Patna
Gaur
Ganges
GANGAS
RADHA
Nadia
SAMATATA
(Calcutta)
Sundradvipa
ORISSA
Puri
BAY OF BENGAL
Andaman Islands
Nicobar Islands
Longitude East 90° of Greenwich
100

culture seem to have been parts of a common programme. The attempts of Pericles to restore Greek temples and foster Greek learning after the ravages of the Persian wars may be recalled in this connection. The example of Bhoja was imitated by Hindu statesmen in later ages, notably by the rulers of Vijayanagar.

The Chandellas of Jejākabhukti or Bundelkhand had, under Dhaṅga, Gaṇḍa, and Vidyādhara, possibly attempted to help the cause of the Shāhis of Udabhāṇḍa, but their efforts proved unavailing. Vidyādhara, however, seems to have matured plans, along with the Kalachuri king and Bhoja of Mālwa, for the restoration of the prestige of Hindu arms. But the power of his family soon declined. There was a revival under Kīrtivarman Chandella in the closing years of the eleventh century, but some of his successors were not so strong as he was. One of them, Paramardideva, suffered defeats at the hands of Prithvīrāja III, the Chauhan king of Ajmer and Delhi. The power of the Chandellas was shattered by Qutb-ud-din Aibak in A.D. 1202. Like the contemporary dynasties of Gujarāt and Mālwa, the Chandellas showed their interest in the work of reconstruction by the building of temples at Khajuraho and the encouragement of poets like Kṛishṇa Miśra who adorned the court of Kīrtivarman.

Politically, a more important *rôle* was played by the Kalachuri kings, Gāṅgeyadeva and his son Lakshmī Karṇa. The former, as already stated above, assumed the title of Vikramāditya and took under his protection the holy cities of Allahābād and Benares. Lakshmī Karṇa seems to have made himself master of the Southern Doāb and did much to revive the glorious traditions associated with the empires of Harsha and Bhoja I. He conciliated the rulers of Bengal by matrimonial alliances and pushed his conquests southwards as far as Kaliṅga. Had he lived longer, he might have restored the shattered fabric of imperialism in northern India and erected an effective barrier against the advance of the Turks. His career was cut short by a hostile combination of the rulers of Gujarāt, Mālwa, Bundelkhand and the Deccan. The Kalachuris still retained considerable power under his son and grandson, but the control of the Madhya-deśa (upper Ganges valley) soon passed into the hands of the famous house of Gāhaḍavāla.

The founder of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty was Chandradeva who rose to power in the closing decade of the eleventh century. His grandson, Govinda Chandra, was the real ruler of the Madhya-deśa for half a century, first as crown prince (1104–1114) and later on as king (1114–1154). He founded an empire embracing the greater part of the present United Provinces and Bihār. He successfully

defended Jetavana (in northern Oudh), Benares and other holy places of Buddhists and Hindus alike against the Turks. But a rival empire was established in the west by the Chauhan Vigraharāja IV with seats at Ajmer and Delhi. The latter city was probably founded by a Tomara chieftain about the middle of the eleventh century A.D., and it was from the Tomaras that the Chauhans obtained possession of this famous capital. Prithvīrāja III, nephew of Vigraharāja IV, came into conflict with Jayachchandra (Jai Chand), grandson of Govinda Chandra. The rivalry of the Chauhans and the Gāhaḍavālas weakened them both till all of them were swept away by a fresh deluge that was gathering force in the wilds of Ghur in Afghānistān.

Bengal under the later Pālas and the Senas

Sheltered by the Kalachuris and the early Gāhaḍavālas who for more than a century protected the Madhya-deśa against a rush of invasion from the north-west, the local dynasts of Eastern India passed through vicissitudes of a different kind. The name of the Pāla sovereign of Gauḍa was still invoked in distant Benares as late as A.D. 1026. In the following decades, the Pālas entered into close relations with Lakshmī Karṇa, the great king of Chedi. The passing away of Karṇa almost coincided with a fresh disaster that fell to the lot of the Gauḍa empire. A local rising in North Bengal drove the Pālas from Varendrī. The power of the house of Dharmapāla was restored by Rāmapāla, mainly with the assistance of his Rāshṭrakūṭa relations. But the restored kingdom had no long lease of life left to it, being ultimately overthrown in Bengal by Vijaya Sena, scion of a family that came from the Deccan. The struggle between indigenous and foreign military chieftains in Bengal ended in the victory of the latter.

The conqueror founded a new line, that of the Senas. The ancestors of the new king came from Karṇāṭa in the Deccan. They established a principality in Western Bengal which came into prominence under Sāmanta Sena. Sāmanta Sena seems to have retained some connection with his southern compatriots. After him came Hemanta Sena. Vijaya Sena, son of Hemanta Sena, allied himself with the illustrious family of the Śūras and founded the independent sovereignty of his own dynasty. He vanquished the king of Gauḍa, apparently of Pāla lineage, and the neighbouring princes of North Bihār, Assam and Orissa. He also laid the foundation of the city of Vijayapura in Western Bengal, which became the metropolis of the Sena family. Vikramapura in

Eastern Bengal, which was apparently conquered from the Yādava Varmans, possibly served as the second capital. It was certainly graced occasionally by the presence of the Sena sovereign.

The son and successor of Vijaya Sena was Ballāla Sena, a name famous in Bengali legend as the reputed founder of *Kulinism*, a system of nobility. He is also credited with the authorship of two notable works, the *Dānasāgara* and the *Adbhutasāgara*.

Ballāla Sena's son, Lakshmaṇa Sena, probably began to rule in A.D. 1178–1179 or 1184–1185, though some scholars push the date of his accession much further back and regard him as the founder of the Lakshmaṇa Sena era of A.D. 1119. He seems to have served his apprenticeship in the work of government as viceroy or military governor in charge of some district in Kaliṅga. On coming to the throne, he distinguished himself as a conqueror and a patron of learning. He claims to have pushed his conquests as far as Kaliṅga, reduced Kāmarūpa to subjection and vanquished the king of Benares, who is no other than the Gāhaḍavāla king of Kanauj. Among the poets who graced his court, the most eminent were Jayadeva, the author of the *Gīta-Govinda*, and Dhoyī, the author of the *Pavanadūta*. The last-mentioned work contains an interesting description of the Sena capital. The Senas, however, failed to stem the tide of Muslim invasion once the dyke erected by the Gāhaḍavālas was broken. Rai Lakhmaniya, usually identified with Lakshmaṇa Sena, had to flee before the advancing arms of Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn Muhammad Khalji towards the close of the twelfth or early in the thirteenth century. His sons, Viśvarūpa Sena and Keśava Sena, maintained the struggle against the "Garga Yavanas", that is to say, the Muslim invaders from the Kābul valley, and preserved their independence in Eastern Bengal till the latter half of the thirteenth century.

The Later Chālukyas and the Cholas

Karṇāṭa, the home territory of the Senas, was from 973 to 1190 dominated, with a short intermission, by the Chālukya family established by Taila II. While the Shāhis of Udabhāṇḍa were trying to defend the north-western gates of India against the Turks of Ghaznī, the Chālukyas were engaged in bitter feuds with the Paramāras of Mālwa and the Cholas of Tanjore. They do not appear to have actually helped the foreign invaders like their predecessors, the Rāshṭrakūṭas. The Cholas, under Rājarāja I

and his famous son, Rājendra Chola I, conquered nearly the whole of the present Madras Presidency. The generals of Rājendra carried their arms as far as the Ganges, while Chola admirals asserted their authority over several overseas territories including Ceylon, the Nicobar Islands and parts of the Malay Peninsula and the Archipelago. Rājendra inflicted a defeat on Mahīpāla I of Bengal. He also vanquished the Chālukya king of the Deccan plateau at Musangi. The prestige of the Chālukya arms was restored, to a certain extent, by Someśvara Āhavamalla, at Koppam, but he suffered a crushing defeat at Kūḍal Śangamam at the hands of a son of Rājendra Chola I. In the last quarter of the eleventh and first quarter of the twelfth century the sovereignty of the Deccan was shared between Vikramāditya VI, the second son of Āhavamalla and Rājendra Chola (III) Kulottuṅga I, son of a daughter of Rājendra Chola I. As already stated above, Vikramāditya VI established a new era in the place of the old reckoning of the 'Śaka' king, and his example was followed by Siddharāja Jayasimha of Gujarāt. The reign of Vikramāditya VI stands as a landmark in the history of Hindu law, and saw the composition of a famous digest by the great jurist Vijñāneśvara. Poetry was also cultivated at the Chālukya court, and the celebrated author Bilhaṇa wrote his *Vikramāṅkadeva-charita*, or Deeds of Vikramāditya, to commemorate the achievements of his patron. Someśvara III, son and successor of Vikramāditya VI, was also a writer of repute.

Sometime after the death of Someśvara III, the power of the Chālukyas of Kalyāṇa was temporarily eclipsed by Bijjala Kalachurya and his sons. After 1190 the empire of Kalyāṇa split up into three parts, namely, the kingdom of Devagiri founded by the Yādavas, the kingdom of Warangal governed by the Kākatīyas and the kingdom of Dorasamudra ruled by the Hoysalas. The Chola empire also declined after Rājendra Chola Kulottuṅga. The southern part of the Chola dominions fell into the hands of the Pāṇḍyas. The home provinces formed a battle-ground between the Hoysalas, the Kākatīyas and other powers. In the country between the Godāvarī and the Ganges which had once been overrun by the great Rājendra Chola I, rose the empire of the Eastern Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga and Orissa.

Successors of the Imperial Chālukyas and Cholas

The independent Yādava kingdom of Devagiri was founded by Bhillama and was raised by his grandson Siṅghana to the position of the premier kingdom of the Deccan. Learning was encouraged, and a college of astronomy was established for the study of the works of Bhāskarāchārya, the celebrated astronomer. The age of the later Yādavas saw the composition of the famous works of Hemādri, Bopadeva, and Jñāneśvara. The rulers of Devagiri, however, proved unequal to the task of defending the Deccan against the northern invader in the manner of Gautamīputra and Pulakeśin II of old. In 1294 the troops of 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī swooped down upon Devagiri and exacted a heavy contribution from Rāmachandra, the Yādava king. In 1306–1307 Malik Kāfur again invaded the Yādava dominions and forced the king to pay tribute. The son of Rāmachandra was killed about 1312, and his son-in-law was flayed alive about 1317. Hindu sovereignty in Mahārāshṭra came to an end and was not restored till the seventeenth century.

The Kākatīyas rose to power under Prolarāja II. His grandson, Gaṇapati, extended his dominions as far as Kāñchī in the south. The kingdom flourished under Rudramma, daughter of Gaṇapati, who is highly extolled by the Venetian traveller, Marco Polo. The power of the dynasty was destroyed by the Sultāns of Delhi early in the fourteenth century.

The Hoysalas of Dorasamudra attained great power under Vishṇuvardhana and his grandson, Vīra Ballāla II. Under later kings they conquered a part of the Tamil country. Vīra Ballāla III, the last notable ruler of the house, sustained defeats at the hands of Kāfur, the general of 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī, and finally perished in or about A.D. 1342.

The Pāṇḍya kingdom, which won fame in the thirteenth century as the dominant power in the Tamil country and a great centre of international trade, was overrun by Kāfur early in the fourteenth century. After a brief period of Muslim rule, it was absorbed into the empire of Vijayanagar.

Orissa became a powerful kingdom under Anantavarman Choḍa Gaṅga whose descendants defended their dominions with some amount of success against the Muslim conquerors of Bengal. The Gaṅga line came to an end in 1434 when it was supplanted by the famous Kapilendra. The royal family founded by him was also very powerful and ruled over an extensive empire. The kings successfully defended Orissa against the attacks of Muslim rulers from the north and west, and sometimes even invaded their dominions.

It was not till 1568 that Orissa was finally conquered by the Muslims.

Like the Rājput kingdoms of the north, the princes of Southern India failed to offer a combined resistance to invaders and fell one by one. Only the Hindus beyond the Kṛishṇā and the Tuṅgabhadrā rallied under the banner of Harihara and Bukka, and for several centuries maintained their independence in the far south of India.

CHAPTER XIV

INDIAN CIVILISATION UNDER THE IMPERIAL GUPTAS AND THEIR SUCCESSORS

The Administrative System

THE period of the Gupta emperors and their successors saw the gradual disappearance of non-monarchical states. After the sixth century, monarchy becomes the only form of government that demands serious attention. Kingship was in most cases hereditary. The ruler was at times nominated by his predecessor, but some cases of election by the people or the nobles are recorded. Among notable instances of popular election are the enthronement of Gopāla by the *Prakṛitis* or constituent elements of the body politic of Bengal, and the choice of Brahmapāla by the people of Assam. We have also a similar instance in Southern India where Nandivarman Pallavamalla was raised to the throne by the *mūla prakṛitis*. More often the choice of a sovereign in a time of crisis was entrusted to a selected body of state nobles or Brāhmaṇas. In the kingdom of Thānesar it was a council of nobles headed by Bhaṇḍi that offered the crown to Harsha. Yaśaskara of Kāshmīr was chosen by an assembly of Brāhmaṇas. Kumārapāla of Gujarāt was selected by the state nobles sitting in council. Even in cases of nomination by a preceding ruler, the presence of the councillors (*Sabhyas*) and princes of the blood at the time of the formal act of selection was perhaps deemed to be necessary. There was no bar to the succession of a female, at least in certain parts of India, notably Kāshmīr, Orissa and the Telugu country.

The divine character of kingship received wide acceptance in the period under review. In the Allahābād Pillar inscription Samudra Gupta is not only represented as equal to Kuvera, Varuṇa, Indra and Yama, the presiding deities of the four quarters, but is considered to be the Incomprehensible Being who is the cause of creation and destruction, a god dwelling on earth, who was mortal only in that he performed the acts necessary according to the conventions of the world. In the literature of the age the king is considered to be the incarnation of Justice and the representative of Vishṇu, that is, God in his aspect as the Preserver. Like Vishṇu,

the ruler in certain parts of India was styled Śrī Prithvī Vallabha, that is, the Beloved of the Goddess of Fortune and of the Earth Goddess. Voices of protest against the view that the king was divine are raised now and then. Bāṇa regards the theory of the king's divinity as a delusion. "Though subject to mortal conditions, kings look on themselves as having alighted on earth as divine beings with a superhuman destiny; they employ a pomp in their undertakings only fit for gods and win the contempt of all mankind. They welcome this deception of themselves by their followers. From the delusion of their own divinity established in their minds, they are overthrown by false ideas." The old theory persists that the rulers do not exist for their own good but owe a debt to the people which they can discharge only by good government. The ideal ruler is he who "possesses an inner soul pervaded by the inclination for the acquittance of debts and obligations, and is occupied with the welfare of all mankind". The Chinese pilgrims, Fa Hien and Hiuen Tsang, the Arab merchant Sulaimān, and the Venetian traveller, Marco Polo, bear testimony to the fact that the governments of Chandra Gupta II, Harsha, Bhoja I and Rudramma (Rudrāmbā) actually tried to translate this noble maxim into practice.

Many kings of the age were doughty fighters and lovers of manly sports like wrestling combats with wild beasts. But they were not mere rough soldiers and war-lords. A notable trait in the character of some of the most illustrious rulers of the period under review is their love of learning and the fine arts. In this respect the versatile Samudra Gupta in the north, and the "curious-minded" (*Vichitra-chitta*) Mahendravarman in the south, set examples that were imitated by some of the ablest among their successors.

Some of the occupants of the throne were themselves scholars and poets of no mean repute. Among royal authors, Harsha of Kanauj, Mahendravarman of Kāñchī, Amoghavarsha I of Malkheḍ, Bhoja of Dhārā, Someśvara III of Kālyāṇa, Vigraharāja IV of Ajmer, Ballāla Sena of Bengal and Aparārka of the Northern Konkāṇ deserve special mention as they have left works that are studied even at the present day. The earliest among them figure mainly as dramatists, but later kings were interested in a wide range of subjects. Several rulers are justly entitled to the designation of polymath. The latest kings took special interest in legal and astrological studies.

Kings normally "held all the levers and handles which worked the governmental machinery". They maintained the laws of the realm and were responsible for defending the people against

external attacks. They administered justice, usually led troops in war and had the largest share in the formulation of policy. But it was impossible to shoulder the burden of administration without assistance. "A single wheel could not move." Hence sovereigns had to employ ministers. In the early Gupta period, the most important among these functionaries were the *Mantrin* (confidential adviser), *Sāndhivigrahika* (minister in charge of peace and war), and *Akshapaṭalādhikṛita* (minister in charge of records). There were also important officials whose duties were mainly of a military character. Such were the *Mahābalādhikṛita* and the *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka*. There was, however, no clear-cut division between civil and military officials. A *Mantrin* could become a *Mahābalādhikṛita*, and the post of *Amātya* could be combined with that of *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka*. The office of a minister (*Sachiva*) was often hereditary. One class of officials had the special designation of *Kumārāmātya*. They figure as ministers for peace and war, generals, councillors, feudatories and district officers. Some of them were directly under the sovereign; others were attached to princes or placed under provincial governors. The expression Kumāra in the designation Kumārāmātya may correspond to the *Elaya*, *Pina*, *Chikka*, or *Immadi* of South India, and is best rendered by the term "cadet". In the far south of India during the Chola period, we have an important functionary, styled *Olainâyagam*, who had to approve every order issued by the king.

With the efflux of time need was felt for the elaboration of the administrative machinery in certain departments. This was particularly the case in regard to the Foreign Office where special *Sāndhivigrahikas* were appointed to deal with the affairs of certain definite areas. Thus, in the records of certain rulers of the Deccan we find references to a *Karṇāṭaka Sāndhivigrahika*. In certain records we have references to an official styled *Mahāpradhāna* and another designated *Sarvādhikārin* whose functions might have resembled those of the *Mukhyapradhāna* of the Marāṭha period and the *Sarvārthachintaka* of Manu. Though the number of ministers was not definitely fixed, Manu's recommendation of seven or eight ministers may have been followed at times. It is doubtful if there was a central *Mantriparishad* comparable to the *Parishā* of the Maurya inscriptions. If such an institution did exist, it does not find prominent mention in the epigraphs. The *Sabhyas* referred to in the Allahābād Pillar inscription in connection with the nomination scene of Samudra Gupta may have been courtiers attending a *Durbar* as well as members of a central council. An important functionary in several States governed by Hindu kings was the

Rāja-guru. The *Purohita* or royal chaplain, though a prominent personage in a Brāhmaṇical court, does not figure in the records of devout Buddhist kings.

Justice was often administered by the sovereign himself or a high official at the centre or in the provinces. Judges at the headquarters of a district had apparently the assistance of the chief *Seṭhs* and *Kāyasthas* of the locality, representatives of the commercial and official classes. In villages, justice was administered by royal officials with the help of the members of the village council or assembly. In certain cases the assembly alone sat in judgment and passed sentence. Special courts of self-governing corporations are also alluded to in literature. The jury system, according to some authorities, is found to have been in full swing at least in southern India. Judicial methods included trial by ordeal.

Indian armies in the period under review consisted mostly of elephants, infantry and cavalry. Chariots gradually fell into disuse. Some of the kings, especially in the desert tracts of Rājputāna, maintained camel corps. A few maritime States had their navies with which they effected the conquest of riparian principalities or islands scattered in the Indian Ocean. Many provinces, especially in the south, had no good breed of horses and had to import animals from Arabia. Marco Polo refers to the unfavourable climate of South India in which these horses could not thrive. He also speaks of the ignorance of the Indian horse-keepers. Recruitment to the army was not confined to a particular caste. Some of the ablest commanders of the period were Brāhmaṇas. A successful leader of North Bengal in the eleventh century A.D. belonged to the Kaivarta caste. Armies of the period included hereditary forces as well as local militia and feudal levies.

The principal sources of revenue were the *bhāga* or the king's share (normally one-sixth) of the produce of the land, certain additional imposts on the rural population, as well as duties at ports, ferries and fortified stations. Rulers also got incomes from the crown-lands, mines, etc., and tribute from vassal chiefs. Taxes were often collected in kind, but payments in cash were also allowed. Forced labour (*Vishṭi*) was not unknown, and we hear of a special kind of *corvée* called *Bhoṭṭa-vishṭi* in lands on the borders of Tibet. Extra taxation was resorted to in times of emergency, from which even temples were not exempted. Mention may be made in this connection of imposts apparently levied by the central government to deal with the menace from marauding tribes. To this category belong possibly the *Mallu-kara* and

Turushka-daṇḍa of mediaeval epigraphs. Extra cesses were also levied for special purposes by local authorities.

Kingdoms and empires were divided for administrative purposes into units styled *Bhukti*, *Deśa*, *Rāshṭra* and *Maṇḍala*. *Bhukti* is a very common designation in the north. It usually meant a province or administrative division under an officer styled *Uparika*. It was usually subdivided into *Vishayas* or *Maṇḍalas*. The post of *Vishayapati* (that is the officer in charge of a Vishaya or district) was filled either by a royal official styled *Kumārāmātya*, or *Āyuktaka* or by a feudatory *Mahārāja*. The Vishayapati was sometimes assisted in the work of administration by the guild-president, the chief scribe and other leading men of the locality. In the far south of India the largest administrative division was the *Maṇḍala*, which was subdivided into *Valanāḍus* or into *Nāḍus* and *Koṭṭams*. The lowest administrative units were the *Kūṟṟam* (union of villages) and *grāma* (village), each under its own headman who was assisted by assemblies (*Ūr*, *mahāsabhā*). The village headman had his counterpart in the *nagarapati* of cities. In certain rural areas the village assembly consisted of the whole adult population, in others of Brāhmaṇas or a few great men who were selected by a kind of ballot. The assembly appointed committees to look after specific departments, like tanks, temples, justice, etc. The work of these self-governing bodies was supervised by royal officers (*Adhikārin*). Towns and cities had, as already stated, special officers styled *nagarapati*, and certain Gupta records refer to the existence of town councils (*Parishad*).

Social Conditions

Social conditions underwent rapid changes during the period under review. This is hinted at by those epigraphs that refer to some of the most distinguished rulers of the age as "employed in settling the system of castes and orders" and in "keeping the castes confined to their respective spheres of duty". Attempts in this direction were not, however, always crowned with success. We find members of the priestly and artisan classes taking to the profession of arms, and members of the soldier caste figuring as merchants. Vaiśyas and Śūdras figure as rulers of mighty kingdoms. Marriage rules were still somewhat elastic, and intermarriages between peoples of different castes, creeds and races were not unknown. Complications were introduced by the influx of foreigners, sections of whom were admitted into the framework of caste. Some of the earlier foreign immigrants rank as degraded Kshatriyas in the legal codes. Those who came after the fall of

the early Gupta empire and carved out independent or semi-independent principalities for themselves, usually found a place among the thirty-six clans of the Rājputs, who now take the place of the Kshatriya families of olden times. Among the new Rājput clans, the Huns and the Pratihāras or Parihars deserve special mention. According to the view generally held by scholars, the Pratihāras belonged to the race of the Gurjaras who came into prominence for the first time in the sixth century A.D. While the ruling families of foreign immigrants and Hinduised border tribes often ranked as Rājputs, the rank and file came under less exalted social groups like the Gujars, the Dhaki Khasiyas, the Bhotiyas and others.

People belonging to the higher castes in the Madhya-deśa (Mid-India) did not, according to the testimony of Fa Hien, "kill any living creature, nor drink intoxicating liquor, nor eat onions or garlic". Sharply distinguished from them were the Chāṇḍālas, who lived apart from others. When they entered the gate of a city or a market-place they struck a piece of wood to make themselves known so that men knew and avoided them, and did not come into contact with them. The existence of impure castes is vouched for, not only by Indian and Chinese records, but by al-Biruni. If the last-mentioned scholar is to be believed, the doctrine of impurity was extended to foreigners in the north-west towards the end of our period. The Hindus of several provinces in the interior, however, did not share the views of their brethren about whom al-Biruni wrote.

The position of women in our period presents certain interesting features. Women of the upper classes in certain areas took a prominent share in administration. The queen-consort clearly occupied an important position in the Gupta period. In succeeding ages we have clear and unequivocal testimony to the existence of queens-regnant in Kāshmīr, Orissa and the Andhra country. A Chinese author represents an Indian princess as administering the government in conjunction with her brother. In some of the provinces, notably in the Kanarese country, women acted as provincial governors and heads of villages. The seclusion of women was not generally observed in these regions. Some of the royal ladies in the Deccan are referred to in contemporary epigraphs as not only skilled in music and dancing but also displaying their proficiency in the arts in public. Princess Rājyaśrī, in Northern India, is represented as sitting behind her royal brother and listening to the exposition of the doctrine of the Great Vehicle by the Chinese Master of the Law. These facts not only suggest that

absolute seclusion of women was unknown in certain families, but that girls, at least of the upper classes, received a liberal education and took a keen interest in the cultural activities of the age. The practice of *Svayamvara*, or self-choice of husband, had also not gone out of use. There was, however, another side to the picture. Polygamy was widely prevalent, but women were not ordinarily allowed to contract a second marriage. The custom of burning widows on the funeral pyre of their husbands was coming into general use, at least among the ruling clans.

State of the Country and the General Condition of the People

We have interesting glimpses of the state of the country and the condition of the people during the Gupta and the post-Gupta periods, thanks to the accounts left by a number of Chinese and Muslim observers. The information derived from this source is supplemented by the testimony of contemporary epigraphs. Referring to the "Middle Kingdom", roughly corresponding to the upper Ganges valley, Fa Hien, the earliest of the Chinese pilgrims whose records have come down to us, and who paid a visit to this country in the days of Chandra Gupta II, observes: "The people are numerous and happy. They have not to register their households, or attend to any magistrates and their rules. The king governs without decapitation or other corporal punishments. People of various sects set up houses of charity where rooms, couches, beds, food and drink are supplied to travellers." South Bihār, in particular, was noted for the wealth and prosperity of its cities and the benevolence and the righteousness of its people. The elders and the gentry of the locality established houses for dispensing charity and medicines. All the poor and destitute in the country, and all who were diseased, went to these houses and were provided with every kind of help. Doctors examined their diseases. In the city of Pāṭaliputra there were two large and beautiful monasteries to which students and inquirers flocked from all quarters to investigate the principles of duty to one's neighbours.

More than two centuries later, when Hiuen Tsang came to this country, vast stretches of territory, notably in the Swāt valley and in Eastern India, once prosperous, now wore an appearance of desolation. Splendid edifices that had adorned them were now in ruins. But with these exceptions the country in general enjoyed the benefits of good government. Taxes were light and the people were not subject to an arbitrary tyranny. Forced service, though not unknown, was sparingly used and labour was usually paid.

Traces of slavery are, however, found up to the end of our period. The roads and river-routes were less safe than in the Gupta period. The criminal code had become more sanguinary. Liberal provision was still made for education and charitable institutions. The great educational establishments in Pāṭaliputra were no longer in existence as the city itself was in ruins. A great seat of learning had, however, sprung up at Nālandā. "In the establishment were some thousands of brethren, all men of great ability and learning. They were looked up to as models by all India. Foreign students came to the establishment to put an end to their doubts, and then became celebrated." Another great centre of culture was Valabhī in Western India. These two places, Nālandā and Valabhī, are compared by I-tsing to the most famous educational institutions of China. We are told that "eminent and accomplished men assembled there in crowds, discussed possible and impossible doctrines, and after having been assured of the excellence of their opinions by wise men, became far famed for their wisdom."

Other centres of learning sprang up in subsequent ages. The names of the first two sovereigns of the Pāla dynasty are associated with the famous establishments of Uddaṇḍapura (Bihār) and Vikramaśīla. Bhoja, the versatile ruler of Mālwa, established a Sanskrit college at Dhārā. During the reign of Siṅghana, the Yādava king of Devagiri in the Deccan, a College of astronomy was founded by a grandson of Bhāskarāchārya. In the far south, Pallava kings extended their patronage to educational institutions at Kāñchī and Bāhur. The last-mentioned place was situated near Pondicherry and had a College where provision was made for the study of the Vedas, Vedāṅgas, Mīmāṁsā, Nyāya, Purāṇas and Dharmaśāstras (ninth century A.D.).

Hiuen Tsang has some interesting observations to make regarding the dress and manners of the people of this country. Their inner clothing and outward attire had no tailoring. As to colour, a fresh white was esteemed. The men wound a strip of cloth round the waist and up to the armpits and left the right shoulder bare. The women wore a long robe which covered both shoulders and fell down loose. The hair of the crown of the head was made into a coil, all the rest of the hair hanging down. Garlands were worn on the head and necklaces on the body. In the far north of India, where the climate was cold, closely-fitting jackets were worn, somewhat like those of the Tartars.

Regarding the character of the people, the pilgrim observes that they were of hasty and irresolute temperament but of pure moral principles. They would not take anything wrongfully, and

they yielded more than fairness required. They did not practise deceit, and they kept their sworn obligations.

The country was famous for its vegetable and mineral wealth. Onions and garlic were little used, and people who ate them were ostracised. Milk, ghee, granulated sugar, sugar candy, cakes and parched grain with mustard seed oil were the common food. Fish, mutton and venison were occasional dainties. The flesh of oxen and some other animals was forbidden. Household utensils were mostly earthenware, few being of brass. The use of copper spoons by the sick is also mentioned. Gold and silver were abundant and were largely used for purposes of coinage. Besides gold and silver coins, cowries and small pearls were also used as media of exchange. Precious substances of various kinds from the sea-ports were bartered for merchandise.

Certain South Indian records throw light on the standard of living of the common people in the days of Chola supremacy. It has been inferred that the average income of a family per month was about rupees sixteen for a member of the upper classes and rupees eight for a member of the lower orders.

Religion

The Gupta age is usually regarded as an era of Brāhmaṇic revival. There can be no doubt that Brāhmaṇism enjoyed imperial patronage. Some of the rulers make a pointed claim to have revived orthodox rites that had been in abeyance for a long period. But the claim need not be taken too literally. It has been rightly pointed out by a shrewd observer that the period of the Guptas is one of culmination, of florescence rather than of renaissance. The recrudescence of Brāhmaṇism in the Ganges valley is as old as the time of Pushyamitra, while in the south we have a long succession of dynasties that counted it as their proud boast to have repeatedly performed Vedic rites like the *Vājapeya* and the *Aśvamedha*. Some of the ablest among the foreign potentates and statesmen of the north, who dominated the stage of Indian history during the period that supervened between the age of the Śuṅgas and that of the Guptas, were the adherents of two great Hindu sects, namely, Śaivas and Bhāgavatas or Vaishṇavas, if not of the Vedic sacrificial religion itself.

The most noticeable features in the religious life of the people during the Gupta age were the growing importance of *Bhakti* (loving faith in God) and the love of fellow-beings which found expression in benevolent activities and toleration of the opinions of others.

Bhakti, that is, intense devotion to God conceived of as personal, a Saviour worthy of trust and ready to be gracious, is an important element of Vaishṇavism and Śaivism as expounded in the *Gītā* and the *Śvetāśvatara Upanishad*. "He who with unwavering practice of devotion (*bhakti yoga*) does God service has crossed beyond the strands" and is fit for salvation. *Bhakti* to Śambhu, that is Śiva, led to the hollowing out by a minister of Chandra



BUDDHA (GUPTA AGE)

Gupta II of a cave at Udayagiri. Devotion to other Adorable Beings found vent in the construction by various sections of the community, royal personages, officials, priests, guilds, etc., of lofty pillars, beautiful gateways, awe-inspiring images and splendid temples in honour of Vishṇu, Kārttikeya, the Sun, the Tīrthaṅkaras and the Buddha. The wide prevalence of a feeling of toleration is well illustrated by epigraphic and literary references to the

employment by Vaishṇava kings of Śaivite and Buddhist officials and the affection felt by Jainas for Brāhmaṇas and by Brāhmaṇas for the Tīrthaṅkaras and the Buddha. Fa Hien testifies to the benevolence and righteousness of the people of the Ganges valley, who not only directed their attention to the ceremonial side of religion, e.g. the celebration of processions of images, but also to the practice of charity. He remarks that "throughout the whole country the people do not kill any living creature, nor drink intoxicating liquor, nor eat onions or garlic. The only exception is that of the Chāṇḍālas."

A list of the important religious sects that flourished at the close of the Gupta age is given in Bāṇa's *Harsha-charita*. We find mention in that work of Jainas, both Digambaras (sky-clad, that is naked) and Śvetāmbaras (white-robed), Vaishṇavas, both Bhāgavatas and Pañcharātras, Saugatas or Buddhists, Mashkarins, possibly identical with the Ājīvikas, and adherents of various schools of philosophy including the Sāṅkhya, the Lokāyatika, the Vaiśeshika, the Vedānta, and the Nyāya.

Buddhism had powerful exponents during the Gupta age in the famous sages and philosophers Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, Kumārajīva and Dignāga. In the succeeding centuries it gradually lost ground. The Hun invasions must have led to the destruction of numerous monastic establishments in the north-west as well as in the east of India. With the deification of the Buddha and his admission into the Vishṇuite pantheon as an incarnation of Nārāyaṇa-Vishṇu, there was little to distinguish the Buddhist laity from their Brāhmaṇical neighbours. Intermarriages between Buddhists and Śaiva or Vaishnava royal families illustrate the absorption and assimilation of the votaries of the reforming cult by the followers of more orthodox creeds. Brāhmaṇa councillors begin to figure as prominently in Buddhist courts as in the darbars of Brāhmaṇical princes. The growth of Tantricism made the distinction between the Vajrayāna type of Buddhism and certain forms of Śaivism and Śāktism purely nominal. The advent of saintly poets and zealous reformers who sang the praise of Vishṇu and Śiva and vigorously combated the heretical doctrines of the Great Vehicle must have weighted the scale in favour of Orthodox Hinduism. With the destruction of the last remnants of the great Buddhist establishments that once covered the entire face of Hindustān by a new race of conquerors in the twelfth and succeeding centuries, Buddhism almost vanished from the land of its birth.

Jainism seems to have enjoyed popularity for a long time in Bengal, certain regions in the United Provinces and the Kanarese

country in South India. Hiuen Tsang found the religion flourishing in Bengal in the seventh century. But it was in Western India that it had its most important stronghold. The canon of the white-robed Jainas was reduced to writing in the fifth or sixth century A.D. as a result of the deliberations of a council held at Valabhī in Western India. The Digambara sect attained eminence during the rule of the Chālukyas of Vātāpi and the Rāshṭrakūṭas of Malkheḍ. The Chālukya king, Vinayāditya (A.D. 680–696), had for his spiritual adviser a famous teacher of the Digambaras. Amoghavarsha (A.D. 815–877), one of the greatest of the Rāshṭrakūṭas, liberally patronised the sect. Jainism also received the homage of Bijjala Kalachurya of Kalyāṇa (1156–1167) and of Kumārapāla Chaulukya of Anhilvara (1143–1172). The last-mentioned monarch was a patron of the famous Jaina Āchārya Hemachandra. To Vimala, Vastupāla, Tejahpāla, ministers of Gujarāt, we owe some of the splendid shrines at Abu, Girnār, Śatrunjaya and other places.

Both Jainism and Buddhism had eventually to yield the palm to the more orthodox forms of Hinduism in most of the provinces where they had once enjoyed popularity and prosperity. Brāhmaṇism had gained ascendency in the Madhya-deśa since the days of Pushyamitra. It enjoyed the almost uninterrupted patronage of the imperial power in that region since the days of the Imperial Guptas. Even Harsha, who had a genuine admiration for Buddhism, is described in official records as a devotee of Maheśvara, that is Śiva. Many of the princes, specially in Mid-India, strove to restore the social order and discipline enjoined in Brāhmaṇical scriptures. The heterodox faiths no doubt continued in some of the outlying provinces, thanks to the patronage of the Pālas, the Karas of Orissa and the Western Gaṅgas of Mysore, but the religion of the Vedas and Purāṇas triumphed in the end in Bengal under the Senas, in Orissa under the Eastern Gaṅgas and in the far south under the later Tamil kings and the Hoysalas. Traces of Buddhism are found in the Deccan as late as the time of Vikramāditya VI, while the prestige of Jainism remained undimmed till the days of Bijjala. It was the rise of the Śrī Vaishṇava sect under Rāmānuja and the Liṅgāyat or Vīra Śaiva sect under Basava that turned the scale definitely in favour of the votaries of Vishṇu and Śiva. Both these great apostles had their precursors.

Śiva Worship

The worship of Śiva found favour with many of the highest officials during the early Gupta age. Pāśupata or Śaiva *āchāṛyas*

are constantly mentioned in contemporary records of the Gupta and post-Gupta periods. These include not only inscriptions but literary works like those of Varāhamihira, Bāṇa, Mahendravarman Pallava and Hiuen Tsang. In the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. Śaivism seems to have replaced Vaishṇavism as the imperial religion of Northern India. It counted among its votaries supreme rulers, foreign as well as indigenous, such as Mihiragula, Yaśodharman, Śaśāṅka and Harsha. Among renowned Pāśupata *āchāryas* of the age was the famous Udyotakara, the writer of a gloss on Vātsyāyana's commentary on the *Nyāya Sūtras*. In the eighth century the country of Kerala on the Mālābar coast produced a teacher who, though not an adherent of any form of sectarian Śaivism, did much to popularise devotion to Śiva among the teeming millions of India. This was the famous Śaṅkarāchāṛya, one of the greatest Hindu philosophers and teachers of the post-Gupta period. Śaṅkara came of a Brāhmaṇa family of Kaladi. He was an ardent Vedāntist and the most powerful exponent of the doctrine of pure monism (*advaita*) which he elucidated in his commentaries on the classical Upanishads, the *Bhagavad Gītā* and the *Brahma Sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa. He was not only a great thinker but an able organiser. Among the most durable monuments of his organising zeal are the famous monasteries at Śriṅgeri in Mysore, Dwārakā in Kāṭhiāwār, Puri in Orissa and Badrināth on the snowy heights of the Himālayas. He died at a comparatively early age, and his memory is held in affectionate reverence by millions of Hindus throughout India.

The province of Kāshmīr in the far north of India produced in the ninth and succeeding centuries a number of teachers who are reckoned among the greatest exponents of the Śaiva doctrine and philosophy. No less important than the Kāshmīr school of Śaivas were the Tamil and Kanarese saints and scholars known as the *Nāyanārs* and *Vīra Śaivas* respectively. Foremost among the Tamil Śaiva saints were Tirujñāna-Sambandar, Appar, Sundaramūrti and Māṇikka Vāsagar. Kanarese Śaivism found a champion in the famous Basava, who has already been mentioned above. Basava was a minister of the Jaina king, Bijjala of the Kalachurya dynasty of Kalyāṇa, who lived in the middle of the twelfth century A.D. A distinguishing feature of the Vīra Śaiva sect of Karṇāṭa to which Basava belonged was its zeal for social reform and special solicitude for the emancipation of women from the thraldom of rigid custom.

ŚIVA OR MAHĀDEVA (JAVA)

The Vaishṇava Movement

Āchāryas devoted to the cult of Vishnu figure prominently in inscriptions of the early Gupta period. The Gupta emperors themselves were votaries of Vishṇu. Bāṇa mentions two important Vaishṇava sects, namely the Bhāgavatas and the Pañcharātras, perhaps worshippers of Vāsudeva and Nārāyaṇa respectively. Some of the early Chālukya kings of Vātāpi professed Bhāgavatism and the famous bas-reliefs at Bādāmi testify to the popularity of the cult in the Deccan in the sixth century A.D. The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* refers to South India, particularly the Tamil country, as a special resort of devotees of Vishṇu. The earliest among the Tamil Vaishṇava saints were the Ālvārs. The most renowned among them seem to have flourished in the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. The Ālvārs represented the emotional side of Vaishṇavism, and they were followed by a line of *āchāryas* who represented its intellectual side. Foremost among the *āchāryas* were Nāthamuni, Yāmunāchārya and Rāmānuja. The last-mentioned teacher was the son of a Brāhmaṇa who lived in a village near Madras. Rāmānuja made Kāñchī and Śrīrangam the chief centres of his activities, but the hostility of the Chola government compelled him to seek shelter at the Hoysala court in the Mysore country. He died in the twelfth century A.D. He combated the absolute monism of Śaṅkara and laid emphasis on *Bhakti* as a means of salvation. The school of philosophy that he established was known as *Viśishṭādvaita* or qualified monism. His followers are known as Śrī Vaishṇavas. Many of the great mediaeval reformers of India drew their inspiration from his teachings.

Shortly after Rāmānuja lived Madhva, a famous exponent of the dualistic school of the *Vedānta*.

Vedic Rites

Vedic rites which Samudra Gupta made attempts to revive after a long period of abeyance in certain areas, had their staunch advocates in the *Pūrva Mīmāṁsā* or *Karma Mīmāṁsā* school represented by Śavarasvāmin, Prabhākara and Kumārila. Śavara's acquaintance with the Great Vehicle may point to a date later than Nāgārjuna of the Kushān-Sātavāhana period. Prabhākara is later than Śavara but earlier than Kumārila, who is probably an elder contemporary of Śaṅkara. In spite of the teaching of the *Mīmāṁsakas*, the *Karma mārga*, or the way of deliverance by the performance

VISHNU (BENGAL)

of Vedic rites, does not seem to have attained amongst the masses of the Hindus the same popularity as the *Bhakti mārga* professed by the ardent sectaries devoted to the cults of Śiva, Vishṇu and associated deities. It is significant that the ancient rite of *Aśvamedha* tends to fall into disuse after the age of the Guptas and the early Chālukyas.

Literary Activity

Bühler observed long ago that during the Gupta age court poetry was zealously cultivated in India. Samudra Gupta took delight in the title of *Kavirāja* or king of poets. He associated with learned people and is said to have put an end to the war between good poetry and prosperity. There can hardly be any doubt that many poets who were none too wealthy received his patronage. The most notable poet of his court was Harisheṇa, the writer of the Allahābād panegyric. Chandra Gupta II, Vikramāditya, son of Samudra Gupta, followed in the footsteps of his father, and counted among his high ministers a poet named Vīrasena-Śāba. Tradition associates the name of Kālidāsa, the greatest of Sanskrit poets after the immortal writers of the two ancient epics, with king Vikramāditya and the *āchārya* Dignāga, who probably flourished during this time. The fame of Kālidāsa and Bhāravi is well attested by Bāṇa and Ravikīrti who adorned the courts of Harsha and of Pulakeśin II respectively. The rulers of Valabhī extended their patronage to the famous author of the *Bhaṭṭi-kāvya*. To the Gupta period have also been assigned the celebrated dramatists who wrote the *Mṛichchhakaṭika*, the *Mudrā Rākshasa* and the *Devī Chandra Guptam*, but the matter is not free from doubt. The seventh century A.D. saw the composition of the works of Bāṇa, Mayūra, Bhartṛihari, Subandhu and the royal poets, Śrī Harsha and Mahendravarman. The portions of the *Purāṇas* dealing with the so-called future kings were apparently compiled during the Gupta age, and it is probable that the *Mahābhārata* received its latest accretions during the same epoch. In the domain of science the Gupta period produced the celebrated astronomers, Āryabhaṭa and Varāhamihira. Even before Varāhamihira's time Indians had invented the decimal notation. The law-books of Nārada and Bṛihaspati are also reckoned by several scholars as products of the same age.

In the post-Gupta period we have in addition to male writers a number of poetesses, among whom Śilabhaṭṭārikā deserves special mention. The *Kaumudī mahotsava* is also ascribed by some scholars

to a female dramatist, but her identity and date are uncertain. Among writers of the opposite sex, Bhavabhūti stands pre-eminent. Both he and Vākpatirāja enjoyed the patronage of Yaśovarman of Kanauj. Towards the end of the ninth century the court of Kanauj was adorned by Rājaśekhara.

Epic poetry and the drama in the period after the Great Guptas did not always reach the level of Bhāravi and Bhavabhūti. But the later age still produced poets and playwrights of ability like Māgha, Śrī Harsha, Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa, Kshemiśvara, and Kṛishṇa Miśra. Lyric poetry flourished long after Bhatṛihari, and the twelfth century saw the composition by Jayadeva of the *Gīta Govinda*, one of the sweetest of the Sanskrit song-books. Works of merit continued to be produced in other fields of learning and literature. The prose romance of Daṇḍin, the later versions of the didactic fables of the *Pañchatantra*, the ethical compositions of Śāntideva and treatises on polity written by Kāmandaka and Somadeva may be mentioned in this connection. In one domain, that of historical literature, the post-Gupta period produced works the like of which had not been seen in earlier ages. The most notable among them were the *Harsha-charita* of Bāṇa, the *Rāmacharita* of Sandhyākara, the *Vikramānka-charita* of Bilhaṇa and the *Rājatarańginī* of Kalhaṇa. Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and other eminent philosophers of the epoch under review do not suffer by comparison with the great masters of the days of Kanishka and the Sātavāhanas. In astronomy, the period of Yādava rule produced the great Bhāskara. We have towards the close of the age under review a number of polymaths like Bhoja of Dhārā, Someśvara III of Kalyāṇa and Kshemendra of Kāshmīr who showed their interest in such diverse subjects as poetry, rhetoric, polity, philosophy, astronomy, architecture, medicine, alchemy, music and painting.

CHAPTER XV

COLONIAL AND CULTURAL EXPANSION

From time immemorial the people of India had free and intimate intercourse with the outside world. Even in the dim pre-historic age, the Neolithic people, as we have seen above, had relations with the Far East, and there are good reasons to believe that they emigrated in large numbers, both by land and sea, and settled in Indo-China and the Indian Archipelago. In the succeeding age, while a high degree of civilisation flourished in the Indus valley, there was undoubtedly a familiar intercourse with the countries of Western and Central Asia. Of the two important races that moulded Indian civilisation, the Aryans apparently, and the Dravidians possibly, came to India from outside, and necessarily relations were established and maintained, at least for some time, with the countries where they had lived before the occupation of India. It would, therefore, be reasonable to assume that India as a whole had never led an isolated life completely cut off from the rest of the world.

The intercourse between India and the countries by which she was surrounded on the north, east and west was maintained during the historical period. In the west, there were trade relations with Babylonia, and also with Syria and Egypt. So far as the most ancient periods are concerned, we have to rely upon indirect evidence, such as the discovery of Indian articles in those lands or the use of Indian names for these articles. From the Maurya period we possess more definite evidence. But the most detailed account that we possess of this trade belongs to the first century A.D. Towards the latter half of this century a Greek sailor, living in Egypt, undertook a voyage to India along the coasts of the Red Sea and the Arabian Sea, and recorded a minute account of his experiences in a book called *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*. We learn from this book that there was active trade between India and the western countries. There were important harbours on the coast such as Barbarike, Barygaza, Muziris, Nelcynda, Bakarai, Korkai, and Puhar, and ships built and fitted up by Indians sailed from these ports with their merchandise which consisted, among other

things, of pearls, precious stones, spices, unguents, and fine cotton cloths called muslins, all of which were in great demand in western countries.

These goods were carried to the harbours on the sea-coast from inland cities by a network of roads. We learn from the same book that Indians settled in some islands of the Arabian Sea for purposes of trade, and the island of Socotra had a colony of Indian merchants.

The account of the *Periplus* is supplemented by later writers. Pliny, for example, complains that for the purchase of luxurious articles Rome pays every year a million sesterces to India. The statement of Pliny is corroborated by the actual discovery of a large number of Roman coins in India which must have been paid for the Indian goods and carried here by way of trade.

It is further proved by the Indian missions sent to Roman emperors. The king of Pāṇḍya sent a mission to Augustus in or about 26 B.C. In later periods we hear of seven missions to Roman emperors. The trade with Rome and other western countries was carried through the important port of Alexandria where goods, carried by sea up to the Red Sea coast, were transported either by land, or by small boats through canals of the Nile. There was also a land-route from India to the Mediterranean coast which ran through Persia and along the shores of the Caspian, to Syria and Asia Minor. This route had become familiar after the invasion of Alexander the Great. During the early centuries of the Christian era, Palmyra (in Syria) was one of the principal centres of this trade.

Both the sea and land routes came under the control of the Arabs when they rose to power in the seventh century A.D. Henceforth the Arabs carried on an active trade with India and we have interesting records of it in the chronicles of the Arab merchants.

It is a well-known fact that culture and civilisation follow in the wake of trade and commerce. We find accordingly that the Indian religion spread to the western countries. Aśoka sent Buddhist missionaries to western Asia, northern Africa and south-eastern Europe, and claimed that the tenets of that religion were welcomed in these regions. We have no means of ascertaining the truth of this from independent evidence, but there is no doubt that even long after Aśoka people in Alexandria showed interest in Buddhism, and that both Buddhist and Brāhmaṇical religion were widely prevalent in several countries of western Asia before the advent of Islam. The knowledge of Indian philosophy and literature in the West is also an undoubted fact. There is, however, equally little doubt that Western culture also flowed to India. The knowledge of Greek and

Roman astronomy and Greek influence on the art and coinage of India are undisputed facts. The Arabs imbibed a great deal of Indian culture, and carried it, along with Indian merchandise, to the western countries. Indian medicine and the wonderful invention of the decimal notation in Arithmetic, among others, became through the Arabs the universal property of the world.

In Central Asia the cultural conquest almost completely overshadows the trade relations of India. Here, partly by missionary propaganda, and partly by the political influence of the Kushāns, Buddhism became almost the universal religion of the nomadic peoples that settled in the vast region between the shores of the Caspian and the Wall of China. Indians also settled in large numbers in the region round modern Khotan. The physical aspects of this region have changed so completely that it is now difficult to imagine that flourishing Indian colonies once dotted the area which now lies buried under the sands of the Taklamakan desert. Yet the archaeological explorations of Sir Aurel Stein and many others in this inhospitable tract have laid bare the ruins of numerous Buddhist *stūpas* and monasteries, the images of Buddhist and Brāhmaṇical gods, and many manuscripts and shorter records written in Indian languages and Indian alphabets. Sir Aurel Stein has remarked that whilst he moved in these excavated areas under the ground he could have believed himself to be in the familiar surroundings of an ancient Indian city in the Punjab, so complete was the Indianisation of these out-of-the-way colonies. Even as late as the seventh century A.D., when Hiuen Tsang passed through Central Asia on his way to and back from India, he noted the dominance of Buddhism and Indian culture over this wide area. It is believed that Chingīz Khān, the great Mongol leader of the thirteenth century, professed some form of Buddhism.

From Central Asia Buddhism spread to China and there it remains a living faith, even to-day, among her untold millions. It is difficult to exaggerate the influence which Buddhism and Indian culture exerted upon the ancient civilisation of China. She showed the proverbial zeal of the new convert. Bands of Chinese monks undertook the perilous journey to India, both by land and sea, in order to study at first hand the religious beliefs and practices of Indian Buddhists and to collect Buddhist books and images. Hundreds and thousands of Buddhist books were carried from India to China and then translated into Chinese. For this purpose not only did the Chinese themselves learn Sanskrit and Pāli, but they also invited Indian Pandits to go to China and collaborate with them in the arduous task of translating the sacred scriptures

of Buddhism. Hundreds of Indian scholars settled in China and dedicated their lives to the pious task. It is singular to note that there are Chinese translations of Buddhist texts whose originals can no longer be traced in India. In addition to this intimate contact established by religion, we have to take note of the political and commercial relations between India and China, and the existence of a fairly regular traffic by way of the sea.

From China, Buddhism spread to Korea, and from Korea to Japan. Buddhism is still a living faith in both these countries, and has moulded their civilisation during the last fifteen hundred years.

Tibet forms a narrow enclave between India and these northern countries. It was not, however, such an exclusive and isolated region as it is to-day, and a regular route from China to Nepāl passed through it. Tibet became a powerful kingdom in the seventh century A.D., and Srong-tsan Gampo, one of its best-known kings (seventh century A.D.), introduced Buddhism into his country. He had married a princess from China and another from Nepāl, and presumably the influence of his queens converted him to the new faith. Along with the new religion, he introduced Indian alphabets and thus was paved the way for a new culture and civilisation in Tibet. As in the case of China, Tibetan Buddhists came to India in large numbers, and the proximity of India enabled them to come into closer contact with the home of Buddhism. The Pāla emperors helped towards the reform of Buddhism in Tibet, and there was a lively intercourse between Tibet and the Pāla kingdom. Tibetan monks studied at the monasteries of Nālandā and Vikramaśīla, and many Indian Buddhist monks visited Tibet. The name of Atīsa Dīpaṁkara, a monk of Eastern Bengal, who visited Tibet in the eleventh century A.D. in the days of Nayapāla, is still held in the highest veneration there. Hundreds of the sacred texts of Buddhism were translated into Tibetan, of which two famous collections, *Tanjur* and *Kanjur*, still exist.

The spirit of maritime adventure in India found its full and free scope in the south-east. Across the Bay of Bengal lay Indo-China and the Malay Archipelago. They were peopled by primitive races, and held almost a monopoly of the world's spice trade. These fertile tracts were also rich in minerals and soon drew the attention of the Indians. The eastern coast of India, from the mouth of the Ganges to Cape Comorin, was studded with ports, some of which are named in the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*. The author of this book refers to some of the Far Eastern countries as Chryse, or the Golden Land. He implies, though he does not expressly state,

that there was a coasting voyage from Bengal to those regions. Ptolemy, in the second century A.D., knew the names of important trading centres in the Malay Peninsula and the islands of Java and Sumatra. Buddhist texts, written about the same period, give a long list of trading centres in the Far East which agrees fairly well with that of Ptolemy. These names are mostly in Sanskrit. There is thus no doubt that by the second century A.D. Indians had developed important trading relations with the Far East. We learn from Ptolemy that there was a direct route from Palura (not far from Chicacole and Gañjām) across the sea to the Malay Peninsula.

Indian literature has faithfully preserved the traditions of the early days of this perilous voyage to unknown lands beyond the sea. The stories preserved in the *Jātakas*, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and other similar collections frequently refer to traders' voyages to Suvarṇabhūmi—the land of gold, which was a general designation of several lands in the Far East. Traders returned with immense riches from the land whose very soil was supposed to be made of gold. On the other hand, many met with shipwreck and there were also sufferings and miseries of other kinds. Some stories represent young Kshatriya princes, dispossessed of their hereditary kingdoms, sailing to Suvarṇabhūmi to restore their fortunes.

To some such Kshatriya enterprise we perhaps owe the foundation of Indian political power in these far-off regions. From the second century A.D. onwards we find reference to kingdoms ruled by persons with Indian names. Their religion, social manners and customs, language and alphabet are all Indian and we may therefore regard these States as Indian colonial kingdoms. Between the second and fifth centuries A.D. such kingdoms were established in the Malay Peninsula, Cambodia, Annam, and the islands of Sumatra, Java, Bali and Borneo. The history of these kingdoms is known, partly from the Sanskrit inscriptions found in those countries, and partly from the accounts preserved by the Chinese. The Brāhmaṇical religion, mainly Śaivism, flourished in these regions, though Buddhism was also not unknown. The indigenous people adopted the civilisation of their masters and there was a gradual fusion between the two races. Hindu customs and manners were no doubt modified to some extent by coming into contact with these people, but still for nearly a thousand years the essential features of Indian civilisation were the dominant characteristics of society in these regions.

The Indian colonists established great kingdoms, some of which lasted for more than a thousand years and continued to flourish

even long after the end of Hindu rule in India. On the mainland of Indo-China there were two powerful kingdoms, those of Champā and Kambuja. The kingdom of Champā comprised, at its greatest extent, nearly the whole of modern Vietnam (Annam). Some of its kings such as Jaya Parameśvaravarmadeva Īśvaramūrti (*c.* 1050–1060), Rudravarman (*c.* 1061–1069), Harivarman (1070–1081), Mahārājādhirāja Śrī Jaya Indravarman (*c.* A.D. 1167–1180), Jaya Simhavarman (*c.* 1257–1287), were great heroes and defended their country successfully against the attacks of their western neighbours, the Kambujas, and the great Mongol chief, Kublai Khān. They had diplomatic relations with the Chinese. After a glorious existence of more than thirteen hundred years (*c.* A.D. 150–1471) their power was virtually broken by the repeated attacks of their northern neighbours, the Annamese, and in the sixteenth century the Hindu kingdom was overrun by these Mongolian hordes. There were many flourishing cities in Champā, and the whole country was adorned with beautiful temples, both Hindu and Buddhist.

The origin of the Hindu kingdom of Kambuja is shrouded in mystery. According to an old legend, Kauṇḍinya married Somā, a Naga princess, and founded the royal dynasty of Kambuja. He planted a spear which he had obtained from Droṇa's son Aśvatthāmā. Another version makes the hero a son of Ādityavaṁsa, king of Indraprastha. In any case, we can trace the earliest Hindu kingdom in Kambuja to the first or second century A.D. It occupied the southern part of Cambodia and was called Fu-nan by the Chinese. It rose to great power, and exercised suzerainty over several vassal states. On its southern frontier was the vassal kingdom of Tuen-sien. A Chinese author writes about this kingdom as follows: "More than a thousand Brāhmaṇas from India reside there. The people follow their doctrines and give them their daughters in marriage. They read their sacred books day and night." The kings of Fu-nan sent ambassadors to both India and China.

The position of supremacy passed in the sixth century to Kambuja-deśa, originally one of the vassal states of Fu-nan. Kambuja-deśa, at first only a small principality in the north-east, has given its name to the whole country, and its kings ruled in great splendour for nine hundred years. Among its most valiant kings may be named Jayavarman I, II, and VII, Yaśovarman, and Sūryavarman II. In the fifteenth century A.D. the invasions of the Annamites from the east and the Thais (who had conquered Siam) from the west reduced the powerful kingdom to a petty principality which became the protectorate of the French, and is now again an independent State.


ANCIENT ASIA
Kilometres
0 400 800 1200 1600
R. Danube
R. Volga
R. Ural
Caspian Sea
Aral Sea
R. Jaxartes
R. Oxus
MACEDON
EPIRUS
Pella
Corinth
Athens
GREECE
Cyrene
Antioch
Palmyra
Alexandria
EGYPT
R. Euphrates
Ctesiphon
Babylon
Susa
Persepolis
Charax
Persian Gulf
MEDIA
Ecbatana
Artemita
BACTRIA
Balkh
Samarkand
Bokhara
SOGDIANA
TURK
DRANGIANA
ARACHOSIA
L. Hamun
SIESTAN
CARMANIA
GEDROSIA
Kabul
Khyber
Bolan
Mulan
R. Nile
RED SEA
ARABIA
Socotra (Dioscorida)
INDIAN
Surparaka
40°
60°


140°
160°
60°
R. Lena
R. Yenesei
SAKHALIN
Kurile Is.
L. Baikal
R. Shilka
R. Amur
40°
MANCHURIA
DESERT
GOBI
JAPAN
Karashar
Kuchi
Tsing Chow
Hoang-ho R.
KHINGAN
SHAN
TIBET
R. Yangtsi-kiang
R. Brahmaputra
HIMALAYA MTS.
KAMARUPA
Kanauj
Benares
Pataliputra
R. Ganges
Prayaga
Tamralipti
SAMATATA
Pagan
Prome
Wang-Chow (Sinassin) or Canton
20°
PHILIPPINE ISLANDS
PACIFIC OCEAN
Mi-Hong
Mison
Dongduong (Indrapura)
Sukhotai
Trakieu (Champa)
Caban (Vijaya)
Angkor Thom (Angkorvat)
Po. Nagar
Nhatrang (Kuthara)
Aruthiao
Cambodia (KAMBUJA)
Phanrang (Pandurangа)
Pnom-Penh
Kaviripaddinam
Ligor
TAMRAPARNI
Takoapa
Kedah
0°
SEA
BORNEO
CELEBES
SUMATRA
BANKA
Palembang
Borobudur
Majapahit
MADURA
Bali I.
OCEAN
JAVA
Dieng Plateau
Prambanan
Singasari
100°
120°
of Greenwich

The kingdom of Kambuja rose to far greater power than Champā. In addition to the whole of modern Cambodia, Cochin-China, Laos, Siam and parts of Burma and the Malay Peninsula were included within the Kambuja empire at its greatest extent. Numerous Sanskrit inscriptions give us the detailed history of their kings, and wonderful temples like Angkor Vat, those of Angkor Thom and a hundred others still tell the tale of their grandeur and magnificence.

Angkor Vat is, in every sense, a wonder of the world. It is a shrine originally dedicated to Vishṇu, and stands on the top of a terraced structure. Each terrace forms a sort of covered gallery, adorned throughout with sculptures, and leads to the next higher one by means of a staircase. There are numerous spires and towers, the eight towers at the four angles of the third and last gallery being each 180 feet high. After ascending the third terrace, we stand in front of the central shrine with its high tower (213 feet above the ground) dominating the entire region. The whole structure is surrounded by a stone enclosure provided with gates and galleries, measuring two-thirds of a mile east to west and half a mile north to south. Outside the enclosure runs a ditch, 700 feet wide. A stone causeway, 36 feet wide, with balustrade, runs over the ditch. It is continued as a broad paved road from the gate of the enclosure right up to the gate of the first terrace, a distance of about two furlongs.

Angkor Thom (Nagaradhāma?) is the modern name of the capital city founded by King Jayavarman VII. The city was square in shape, each side measuring more than two miles. It was surrounded by a moat 330 feet broad and enclosed by a high stone wall. The centre of the city was occupied by the grand temple of Bayon. It is pyramidal in shape and has three stages, adorned with high towers, nearly forty in number. The central tower dominating the whole structure is nearly 150 feet high. Each of these towers has a finely carved human face on four sides, representing the Buddhist deity Avalokiteśvara, or rather king Jayavarman VII, conceived as such. Several other massive structures, both religious and secular, surrounded the temple of Bayon.

The city gates, with towers and guard-houses, were imposing structures. Five avenues, about 100 feet wide, run from the gates to the heart of the city, a distance of a mile. The city was adorned with a large number of tanks with embankments, and a royal terrace about 1,200 feet in length and 13 feet in height with sculptured reliefs of exquisite quality. In short, everything was conceived on a truly noble scale, and it was one of the grandest cities in the whole world in that age.

ANGKOR VAT (CAMBODIA)

The Malay Peninsula and the Indian Archipelago saw the rise and fall of two big Hindu empires. The first empire was founded by the Śailendra dynasty in the eighth century A.D. It comprised the Malay Peninsula and nearly the whole of the Archipelago including the islands of Sumatra, Java, Bali and Borneo. The Arab merchants who traded in these parts described in rapturous terms the power, wealth and magnificence of the grand monarch who exercised supreme sway and styled him "Mahārāja". He owned a powerful navy and made successful raids both against Champā and Kambuja. According to the Arab writers, he "was overlord of a large number of islands over a length of 1,000 parsangs or more". Many of these chroniclers tell the story how the Mahārāja every morning threw into a lake a brick made of solid gold. According to the Arab accounts, the Mahārāja was held in high esteem by the rulers of both India and China. Ibn Rosteh, writing about A.D. 903, remarks: "The great king is called Mahārāja, i.e. king of kings. He is not regarded as the greatest among the kings of India because he dwells in the islands. No other king is richer or more powerful than he, and none has more revenue." Ibn Khordadzbeh (A.D. 844–848) estimates the daily revenue of the king as two hundred maunds of gold.

The Śailendra kings were followers of Mahāyāna Buddhism and had diplomatic relations with the rulers of China and India. King Bālaputradeva sent an ambassador to the emperor Devapāla of Bengal (p. 158), requesting him to grant five villages to the monastery which he (Bālaputradeva) had built at Nālandā. Devapāla, of course, granted the request. It appears that the Śailendras derived their religious inspiration from Bengal which was then the chief centre of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India. Kumāraghosha, a Buddhist monk of Bengal, became the *guru* or preceptor of the Śailendras, and at his bidding the Śailendra emperor constructed the beautiful temple of Tārā. The Śailendras were great builders and the famous *stūpa* of Barabudur stands to this day as the living monument of their grandeur and magnificence. This noble building, situated on the top of a hill, consists of a series of nine successive terraces, each receding from the one beneath it, and the whole crowned by a bell-shaped *stūpa* at the centre of the topmost terrace. The lowest terrace has an extreme length of 131 yards. The five lower terraces are each enclosed on the inner side by a wall supporting balustrades so as to form four open galleries. The three uppermost terraces are encircled by a ring of *stūpas*, each containing an image of Buddha within a perforated framework. The galleries are covered with sculptures, illustrating scenes from Buddhist texts, and the

BARABUDUR (JAVA)

balustrades are decorated with small niche-temples containing images of Buddha. The images and sculptures are the finest examples of Indo-Javanese art. When we remember that the structure is nearly 400 feet square and that its successive galleries are full of sculptures and images of Buddha, exhibiting the highest skill and workmanship, we may well understand why Barabudur is referred to as the eighth wonder of the world. The art of Java and Kambuja was no doubt derived from India and fostered by the Indian rulers of these colonies, but Barabudur and Angkor Vat far exceed in grandeur of conception and skill of execution anything that we know of in India itself.

The Śailendras ruled in glory till the eleventh century A.D. when the Cholas cast covetous eyes upon the rich maritime empire. Rājendra Chola I (p. 181) possessed a magnificent fleet and invaded the dominions of the Śailendras. His efforts were successful and he conquered a large part of the Śailendra empire. But it was not an easy task to keep such distant provinces under control. The Śailendras continued the struggle and shook off the Chola supremacy after nearly a century. But soon their power declined and an ill-fated expedition against the island of Ceylon in the thirteenth century brought about the final disruption of the empire.

The decline and downfall of the Śailendras gave an opportunity to an aspiring kingdom in the island of Java to assert its power. A Hindu kingdom had been established in the island as early as the fourth century A.D. but it was conquered by the Śailendras. Java formed a part of the Śailendra empire till the ninth century A.D. when it recovered its independence. The seat of political power was, however, removed from the central part of the island, which was at one time the centre of Śailendra power and contained their famous monuments, including Barabudur. Henceforth Eastern Java, with its seat of power at first at Kediri and then at Singhasari, played the dominant part in politics. Towards the close of the thirteenth century A.D. a new royal dynasty was founded by king Vijaya with the city called Tikta-vilva (bitter *vilva* fruit) or its Javanese equivalent, Majapahit, as its capital. The kingdom of Majapahit conquered the surrounding islands, and by the year A.D. 1365 the empire of Majapahit included nearly the whole of the Malay Peninsula and the Malay Archipelago. Roughly speaking, it comprised the Dutch possessions in the Archipelago in the 19th century with the addition of the Malay Peninsula, but excluding perhaps northern Celebes.

Early in the fifteenth century A.D. a fugitive Hindu chief of Java founded the kingdom of Malacca, which soon rose to be a great political power and an important commercial centre. The conversion of its second king to Islam made Malacca a stronghold of that faith, which soon reacted on neighbouring territories. The new faith penetrated into Java, in the wake of trade and commerce, and even some members of its royal family were converted to it. By a concerted attempt of the votaries of the new faith, the ruler of Majapahit was driven from the throne at the beginning of the sixteenth century. With the fall of the Hindu kingdom of Majapahit, the whole of the island was converted to Islam. But the royal family and a large element of the Hindu population took refuge in the island of Bali, which had been a Hindu colony for nearly a thousand years. With the exception of this island, where Hinduism flourishes even to-day, the rest of the Malay Archipelago, generally speaking, adopted the faith and culture of Islam.

Indian art and literature flourished in Java to an extent unknown elsewhere. There are still hundreds of temples in ruins, and an extensive literature, in manuscripts, based on Sanskrit. The *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* were most popular in that island, and even to-day furnish the theme of their popular shadow-play, called Wajang, and theatrical performances. With the fall of Majapahit, artistic activities came to an end in Java.

We may conclude with a broad survey of the Indian colonies in the Far East. For nearly fifteen hundred years, and down to a period when the Hindus had lost their independence in their own home, Hindu kings were ruling over Indo-China and the numerous islands of the Indian Archipelago, from Sumatra to New Guinea. Indian religion, Indian culture, Indian laws and Indian government moulded the lives of the primitive races all over this wide region, and they imbibed a more elevated moral spirit and a higher intellectual taste through the religion, art and literature of India. In short, the people were lifted to a higher plane of civilisation. A greater India was established by a gentle fusion of races, which richly endowed the original inhabitants with the spiritual heritage of India. So long as Hinduism was in full vigour at home, Hinduism in the colonies was also a vital force, but the downfall of the Hindus in India also led to the decay of their colonial supremacy. The fountain head having dried up, the streams fed by it were also gradually choked, leading to their ultimate disappearance. It is no mere accident that from after A.D. 1100 or 1200 Hinduism had spent its force in the colonies, and the indigenous element

began gradually to assert itself till Islam was firmly planted in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries A.D.

The history of the colonies demonstrates the unsoundness of the popular belief that Hinduism cannot be adopted by foreigners but is meant only for those who are born within its fold. It shows the great vigour with which it could absorb and vitalise foreign culture and could elevate even the most primitive races to a higher sphere of culture and civilisation. If we remember that Indian culture and civilisation played a similar role, though perhaps in a lesser degree, in western, central and eastern Asia, we can realise an aspect of the true greatness of India, not always sufficiently emphasised. The colonial and cultural expansion of India is one of the most brilliant, but forgotten, episodes of Indian history, of which any Indian may justly feel proud.

CHAPTER XVI

MONUMENTS OF ANCIENT INDIA

The Pre-historic Period

In a previous chapter, reference has been made to the artistic relics of the pre-historic period. They consist, first, of Neolithic implements, and secondly, of seals, buildings, sculptures and implements of copper and bronze found at Mohenjo-Daro and a few other sites.

The most artistic objects at Mohenjo-Daro are no doubt the seal-engravings, portraying animals like the humped bull, the buffalo, the bison, etc. Regarding these, Sir John Marshall observes as follows:

> "In no sense can these objects be regarded as products of primitive or archaic art. Small as they are, they demonstrate a thorough comprehension of both work in the round and relief, and exhibit a spontaneity and truthfulness to nature of which even Hellenic art might not have been ashamed."

The same author makes the following remarks on two stone statues found at Harappa:

> "When I first saw them I found it difficult to believe that they were pre-historic; they seemed so completely to upset all established ideas about early art. Modelling such as this was unknown in the ancient world up to the Hellenistic age of Greece."

Maurya Period—the Origin of Art

The earliest ruins of Harappā and Mohenjo-Daro have been assigned to a period not later than 2700 B.C. For more than two thousand years after that we possess no ancient monuments that deserve any serious consideration.

In the historical period, we have ruins of monuments that may be referred to as early a period as 500 B.C. But it is only in the age of Aśoka, the great Maurya emperor, that we come across

AŚOKAN PILLAR, LAURIYA-NANDANGARH
By courtesy of the Archaeological Department and Lucknow University

monuments of high quality in large number which enable us to form a definite idea about the nature of Indian art.

The finest examples of Aśokan art are furnished by the monolithic pillars (see p. 218) on which his edicts are engraved. Each pillar consists of a shaft or column, made of one piece of stone, supporting a capital made of another single piece of stone. The round and slightly tapering shaft, made of sandstone, is highly polished and very graceful in its proportions. The capital, equally highly polished, consists of one or more animal figures in the round, resting on an abacus engraved with sculptures in relief; and below this is the inverted lotus, which is usually, though perhaps wrongly, called the Persepolitan Bell. A high degree of knowledge of engineering was displayed in cutting these huge blocks of stone and removing them hundreds of miles from the quarry, and sometimes to the top of a hill. Extraordinary technical skill was shown in cutting and chiselling the stone with wonderful accuracy and in imparting the lustrous polish to the whole surface. But these pale into insignificance before the high artistic merits of the figures, which exhibit realistic modelling and movement of a very high order. The capital of the Sārnāth Pillar is undoubtedly the best of the series. The figures of four lions standing back to back, and the smaller figures of animals in relief on the abacus, all show a highly advanced form of art and their remarkable beauty and vigour have elicited the highest praise from all the art-critics of the world. The late Dr. V. A. Smith made the following observation on the Sárnáth capital:

> "It would be difficult to find in any country an example of ancient animal sculpture superior or even equal to this beautiful work of art, which successfully combines realistic modelling with ideal dignity and is finished in every detail with perfect accuracy."

Many other pillars of Aśoka, though inferior to that of Sārnāth, possess remarkable beauty. It may be mentioned in this connection that the jewellery of the Maurya period also exhibits a high degree of technical skill and proficiency.

As compared with sculptures, the architectural remains of the Maurya period are very poor. Contemporary Greek writers refer to magnificent palaces in the capital city of Pāṭaliputra and regard them as the finest and grandest in the whole world. Some seven hundred years later the Mauryan edifices inspired awe and admiration in the heart of the Chinese traveller, Fa Hien. But these noble

CAPITAL OF ASOKAN PILLAR, SARNATH (NEAR BENARES)
By courtesy of the Archaeological Department and Lucknow University

buildings have utterly perished. Recent excavations on the site have laid bare their ruins, the most remarkable being those of a hundred-pillared hall.

The extant architectural remains consist, besides a small monolithic stone rail round a *stūpa* at Sārnāth, mainly of the rock-cut Chaitya halls in the Barabar hills and neighbouring localities in the Bihar subdivision of the Patna district. Although excavated in the hardest rock, the walls of these caves are polished like glass.

Aśoka also built quite a large number of *stūpas*. The *stūpa* is a solid domical structure of brick or stone, resting on a round base. It was sometimes surrounded by a plain or ornamented stone railing with one or more gateways, which were often of highly elaborate pattern and decorated with sculptures. Tradition credits Aśoka with building 84,000 *stūpas* all over India and Afghānistān but they have almost entirely perished. Some of them, enclosed and enlarged at later times, perhaps still exist, the most famous example being the big *stūpa* at Sāñchī, in Bhopal State, not far from Bhilsa. The diameter of the present *stūpa* is 121½ feet, the height about 77½ feet, and the massive stone railing which encloses it is 11 feet high. According to Sir John Marshall, the original brick *stūpa* built by Aśoka was probably of not more than half the present dimensions, which were subsequently enlarged by the addition of a stone casing faced with concrete. The present railing also replaced the older and smaller one. A similar fate has possibly overtaken many other *stūpas* of Aśoka.

It is quite evident from what has been said above, that Maurya art exhibits in many respects an advanced stage of development in the evolution of Indian art. The artists of Aśoka were by no means novices, and there must have been a long history of artistic effort behind them. How are we then to explain the almost total absence of specimens of Indian art before *c.* 250 B.C.?

This is the problem which faces us at the very beginning of our study of Indian art—highly finished specimens of art, belonging to such remotely distant periods as 2700 B.C. and 250 B.C., with little to fill up the long intervening gap.

We are not in a position to solve this problem until more data are available. In the meantime we can only consider various possibilities.

First, it is not unlikely that the artistic traditions of the Indus valley continued down to the Maurya period. The absence of specimens has to be explained by the supposition that most of the monuments being made of wood or other perishable materials



have left no trace behind. Rare specimens in stone or other durable materials may yet be unearthed by future excavations. This solution is prompted by the analogous problem of Indian alphabets. The earliest Indian alphabets so far known, and from which all the current Indian alphabets have been derived, are those found in the inscriptions of Aśoka. How they came to be evolved into that finished stage has been a mystery, and attempts have been made to derive them from various types of alphabets in Western Asia. But the numerous seals found at Mohenjo-Daro and Harappā with pictorial writings (in which an alphabet or a syllable is represented by a pictorial illustration of a material object) have induced some scholars to regard these as the origin from which the Brāhmī alphabet of Aśoka has been ultimately derived. In a similar way, the artistic traditions of the Aśokan period might be ultimately traced to those of the Indus valley. But in both cases, the intermediate stages of development or processes of evolution are hidden from us.

Secondly, it is permissible to hold that the art-traditions of the Indus valley were gradually lost and that Mauryan art has an independent history. What that history may be is involved in doubt, and it is possible to entertain two different views on the subject. We may either hold that, in addition to works in wood, the Indian artists of the pre-Maurya period also excelled in works in stone, though these have perished or not yet come to light. Or we may suppose that the Indians first began to work in stone during the Maurya period. The results of their endeavour to change from wood to stone are seen in the crude inferior pillars of Aśoka while those which are excellent and highly finished were the work of foreign artists employed by that great emperor. According to this theory, Indian art continued more or less under this foreign tutelage long after Aśoka, until a full-fledged Indian art was developed under the Imperial Guptas.

From the End of the Maurya Period to the Rise of the Guptas

The five hundred years that intervened between the fall of the Mauryas and the rise of the Gupta empire constitute a distinct period in the evolution of Indian art. So far as we can judge from extant remains, several important schools of sculpture flourished in different localities during this period—at Bhārhut (Nagod and Sāñchi in Madhya Pradesh, Bodh-Gayā in Bihār, Mathura in U.P., Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa near the mouth of the Kṛishṇā river, and Gandhāra in West Pākistān.

In the second century B.C., during the reign of the Śuṅgas, a big *stūpa* was constructed at Bhārhut. Nothing now remains of the *stūpa* itself, but a portion of the railings that surrounded it, and one of the gateways, are now preserved in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. The railing is made of red sandstone and consists, as usual, of uprights, crossbars and coping-stone. All these have sculptures engraved on them representing incidents from Buddha's life, Jātaka stories and many humorous scenes. Short labels incised below the sculptures enable us to identify the episodes represented therein. Taken individually, the human figures do not appear to be well executed and there are obvious defects in the physiognomy and posture of the bodies. But taken as a mass, the sculptures represent the religious faiths and beliefs, the dress, costumes, and manners, and are executed with wonderful simplicity and vigour. We get an insight into the minds and habits of the common people of India, and a keynote of the joys and pleasures of life seems to pervade them all. Ancient India, with its robust optimism and vigorous faith in life, speaks, as it were, through these stones, in a tone that offers a sharp but pleasing contrast to the dark pessimistic views of life which some of the old religious texts are never tired of repeating. From this point of view, the art of Bhārhut is a great corrective to the impressions which we are likely to form from literature.

At Bodh-Gayā there is a small railing round the great temple. The railing probably belongs to about the first century B.C., but the temple is of a much later date. The sculptures on the railing belong to the same type as at Bhārhut, though the individual figures are somewhat better.

Sāñchī contains three big *stūpas* and, happily, they are all in a good state of preservation. The big *stūpa*, originally constructed by Aśoka, was enlarged during this period, and four gateways of elaborate construction were added to the railing, one in each cardinal direction. Although the railing is quite plain, the gateways are full of sculptures, illustrating the Jātaka stories and various episodes in the life of Gautama Buddha. The scenes represented are similar to those of Bhārhut, and convey more or less the same ideas, but the individual figures, the method of their grouping, mode of expression, and decorative elements—all show a far higher standard of technical skill and artistic conception. The obvious defects in the representation of the physique at Bhārhut are removed, and human figures are elegantly carved and shown in various difficult moods and poses. The sculptors of Sāñchī are throughout inspired

by a far higher sense of beauty, rhythm, and symmetry, and possess the difficult art of telling a complicated story in a simple lucid way. As at Bhārhut, we find before us a wonderful panorama of scenes of daily life and concrete illustrations of faith, hope, and ideals, though as a rule these are more complex and varied in character, showing a more intelligent appreciation of the facts and views of life.

On the whole, the railings at Bhārhut, Bodh-Gayā and Sāñchī may be regarded as three landmarks in the gradual evolution of

SĀÑCHĪ GATEWAY

art during the two centuries, 150 B.C.–A.D. 50. The Indian artists had now mastered the difficult technique and acquired a highly-developed aesthetic sense. The stone sculptures proved in their hands to be a valuable medium for expressing faiths and beliefs, and ideas and feelings.

Mathurā has proved a large treasure-house of ruins of this period. No big railing, like that of Bhārhut or Sāñchī, with a continuous series of relief sculptures, has yet come to light, but we have instead numerous fragments of smaller railings with

sculptures, and quite a large number of images, either detached or engraved in very high relief on some architectural fragments.

Photo: A. K. Coomaraswamy

KUSHĀN KING, MATHURĀ

The Mathurā sculptures are easily distinguished by the material used—a kind of spotted red stone. It is possible to classify the sculptures of Mathurā into two chronological periods. The earlier ones are rude and rough works, somewhat resembling those of

Bhārhut, but of a different style, and do not call for any special remark. The sculptures of the later period possess one distinguishing characteristic, viz. the representation of Buddha as a human figure. This is entirely unknown at Bhārhut, Bodh-Gayā and Sāñchī where Buddha is always represented by a symbol such as a wheel, a throne, or a pair of footprints, and never by any human figure. With the evolution of a human type of Buddha at Mathurā begins a new epoch in Indian art, and for centuries the best artistic efforts of India were directed towards giving a concrete expression of the spiritual ideals of India through the images of Buddha and other great beings.

The Gandhāra School

The Gandhāra school of sculpture has attained a celebrity perhaps beyond its merits. There was a time when European scholars considered it as the only school in ancient India which can rightfully claim a place in the domain of art. Many still regard it as the source of all subsequent development of art in India and the Far East. In spite of the undeniable merit of Gandhāra sculptures, the above views seem to be highly exaggerated.

The Gandhāra sculptures have been found in the ruins of Taxila and in various ancient sites in Afghānistān and West Pākistān. They consist mostly of images of Buddha and relief-sculptures representing scenes from Buddhist texts. Some technical characteristics easily distinguish them from all other specimens of Indian sculpture. In the first place, there is a tendency to mould the human body in a realistic manner with great attention to accuracy of physical details, especially by the delineation of muscles and the addition of moustaches, etc. Secondly, the representation of the thick drapery with large and bold fold-lines forms a distinct characteristic.

The Gandhāra sculptures accordingly offer a striking contrast to what we meet with elsewhere in India, viz. the smooth round features of the idealised human figures, draped in a transparent or semi-transparent cloth, closely fitting to the body and revealing its outline.

These distinguishing characteristics of Gandhāra sculpture were undoubtedly derived from Greek art, or, to be more precise, the Hellenistic art of Asia Minor and the Roman empire. Gandhāra art is accordingly known also as Indo-Greek or Graeco-Roman. There is, also, no doubt that this art owed its origin to the Greek rulers of Bactria and North-West India. But though the technique

was borrowed from Greece, the art was essentially Indian in spirit, and it was solely employed to give expression to the beliefs and practices of the Buddhists. With a few exceptions, no Greek story or legend, and no Greek art *motif* has been detected among the numerous specimens of Gandhāra sculpture. The Gandhāra artist had the hand of a Greek but the heart of an Indian.

BODHISATVA, LAHORE MUSEUM

The most important contribution of Gandhāra art was the evolution of an image of Buddha, perhaps an imitation of a Greek God like Apollo. Fine images of Buddha and Bodhisatva, and relief-sculptures illustrating various episodes of Buddha's present and past lives, are remarkably executed in a kind of black stone. For a long time it was believed that the Gandhāra Buddha image served as the model for those executed at Mathurā and other centres. But it is now recognised that the Buddha image was evolved independently at Mathurā and Gandhāra. There is a striking difference between the Buddha images of Gandhāra and those of the Indian interior. The former laid stress on accuracy of anatomical details and physical beauty, while the latter strove towards imparting a sublime and spiritual expression to the figure. The one was realistic and the other idealistic, and this may be regarded as the vital difference between Western and Indian art. The rich and varied contents of Gandhāra sculpture, like those of Sāñchī and Bhārhut, hold before us a mirror, as it were, reflecting ancient life and ideals.

It may be added that both the schools of Mathurā and Gandhāra flourished under the lavish patronage of Scythian kings. The

portrait-statues of the Kushān kings add a novel feature to the art of this period. The Kushān art, particularly that of the Gandhāra school, spread through Chinese Turkestan to the Far East and influenced even the arts of China and Japan.

Somewhat later than the flourishing period of the schools of sculpture described above, beautiful *stūpas* were erected in the



India Office, London

CASING SLAB, AMARĀVATĪ STŪPA

lower valley of the Kṛishṇā river, at Amarāvatī, Jagayyapeta and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa. Not only were the railings of the Amarāvatī *stūpa* made of marble, but the dome itself was covered with slabs of the same material. It must have produced a marvellous effect, when intact. Unfortunately, the entire *stūpa* is in ruins, and the fragments of its railings have been removed, partly to the British Museum, London, and partly to the Government Museum at Madras. The sculptures of all the *stūpas* resemble one another and

are marked by striking differences in style from those of Northern India. Hence they are classed as belonging to a new school, viz. that of Amarāvatī. The figures at Amarāvatī are characterised by slim, blithe features and they are represented in most difficult poses and curves. But the scenes are mostly overcrowded, and although there is a distinct charm in individual figures, the general effect is not very pleasing. Yet there is no doubt that the technique of art had reached a high degree of development. The plants and flowers, particularly the lotuses, are most admirably represented in this school. The image of Buddha occurs here and there, but the Blessed One is often represented by a symbol. It thus points to the period of transition between Bhārhut, Bodh-Gayā and Sāñchī on the one hand and Mathurā and Gandhāra on the other.

At Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, important relics of the period have recently been discovered as a result of excavations made by the Archaeological Survey of India. The finds include a *stūpa*, two Chaityas and a monastery. Near the *stūpa* were found slabs of limestone illustrating scenes from Buddha's life. The panel shown on p. 231 represents the nativity and seven footprints of Buddha on the piece of cloth held by the deities, who were present to welcome the arrival of the Blessed One.

The period under review (*c.* 200 B.C. to A.D. 320) is not so rich in architecture as in sculptures. There were, of course, beautiful temples and monasteries, and the famous tower of Kanishka at Purushapur (Peshāwār) was one of the wonders of Asia. But all these have perished without leaving any trace behind. Excepting the *stūpas* referred to above, there is only one class of buildings which merit serious attention as works of art. These are the caves hewn out of solid rock, of which hundreds have been found in different parts of India. The caves of the Aśokan period were plain chambers, but now the addition of pillars and sculptures made them beautiful works of art. Some of the caves were used as monasteries, i.e. residences of monks. These were quite plain and consisted of a central hall with small cells on all sides. Others were used as Chaityas or halls of worship. A Chaitya was a fine work of art. The fully developed specimen consisted of a long rectangular hall with apsidal end (i.e. the side opposite the entrance was semicircular and not straight). Two long rows of pillars divided the hall into a nave (big central part) and two side aisles (narrow parts at the two sides). A small *stūpa*, called a *Dāgoba*, stood near the apsidal end. The front wall was decorated with elaborate sculptures, and there were three small doorways leading to the nave and the side aisles. But a big horseshoe window above

the central doorway admitted a volume of light which illumined the *Dāgoba* at the far end. When worshippers assembled in comparative darkness in the nave (central part) before the bright *Dāgoba* in front, the effect must have been very solemn and impressive.

There are many such Chaitya caves at Nāsik, Bhājā, Bedsā, Kārle and other places in the Bombay Presidency. The Kārle cave is unanimously regarded as the finest specimen, on account of the beauty of the sculptures on the front wall, the remarkable rows

PANEL ILLUSTRATING THE NATIVITY OF THE BUDDHA, NĀGĀRJUNIKOṆḌA

of pillars inside the hall, and the fine proportion of the different parts of the building.

In addition to the pillars inside these caves, we have also several free-standing pillars, as for example that at Besnagar which was dedicated as a *Garuḍadhvaja* by the Greek ambassador, Heliodoros. They are in many cases monoliths (in the case of rock-cut caves they are necessarily so) but they lack the wonderful polish, the fine proportions and the grand capitals which characterise the best pillars of Aśoka. In this respect there was undoubtedly a decline. But in sculptures and the construction of *stūpas* and caves there was wonderful progress. It is perfectly true that the fine figures of certain animals which we see on the pillars of Aśoka have no

CHAITYA CAVE, KÂRLE.

parallel in subsequent times, but the loss is made up by the delineation of human figures and the evolution of the wonderful image of Buddha.

The Gupta Period (A.D. 320–600)[1]

With the Gupta period we enter upon the classical phase of Indian sculpture. By the efforts of centuries techniques of art were perfected, definite types were evolved, and ideals of beauty wer formulated with precision. There was no more groping in the dark, and no more experiments. A thorough intelligent grasp of the true aims and essential principles of art, a highly developed aesthetic sense, and a masterly execution with steady hands produced those remarkable images which were to be the ideal and despair of the Indian artists of subsequent ages. The Gupta sculptures not only remained models of Indian art in all times to come, but they also served as such in the Indian colonies in the Far East. The sculptures of the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, Java, Vietnam, Cambodia and even Celebes bear the indelible stamp of Gupta art.

The most important contribution of Gupta art is the evolution of the perfect types of divinities, both Buddhist and Brāhmaṇical. A large number of Buddha images have been unearthed at Sárnáth near Benares, and one of them is justly regarded as the finest in the whole of India. Stone and bronze images of Buddha have also been found at Mathurā and other places. The images of Śiva, Vishṇu and other Brāhmaṇical gods are sculptured in some of the finest panels of the Deogarh temple (Jhansi district) and also occur elsewhere. These images are the best products of Indian art. They present a beautiful figure, full of charm and dignity, a graceful pose and a radiant spiritual expression. In general, a sublime idealism, combined with a highly-developed sense of rhythm and beauty, characterises the Gupta sculptures, and there are vigour and refinement in their design and execution. The intellectual element dominates Gupta art and keeps under control the highly-developed emotional display and the exuberance of decorative elements which characterise the art of succeeding ages.

The art of casting metals reached a degree of development which may well be regarded as wonderful. Hiuen Tsang saw at

[1] Although the political supremacy of the Imperial Guptas did not last much beyond A.D. 495, the style of art ushered in by them continued till A.D. 600 or even somewhat later. Hence the title "Gupta period" in relation to art covers a much longer period than what would be understood in political history.

Nālandā a copper image of Buddha, about 80 feet high. The Bronze Buddha, found at Sultānganj, is 7½ feet high and is a fine piece of sculpture. The Iron Pillar of Delhi, near the Qutb Minār, is a marvellous work belonging to the early Gupta period. A centur-

By courtesy of the Indian Museum, Calcutta

NARA-NĀRĀYANA, DEOGARH TEMPLE

ago, it would have been difficult, even for the best European foundry, to manufacture a similar piece made of wrought iron.

The art of painting reached its height of glory and splendour in this age. The fine fresco-paintings on the walls and ceilings of the Ajantā Caves have extorted the unstinted admiration of the

whole world. Of the twenty-nine caves, sixteen contained paintings which survived, to a greater or less extent, even as late as 1879. Most of these, it is sad to think, have been destroyed, and the rest are also gradually crumbling to dust. Although some are as old as the first century A.D., most of them belong to the Gupta Age. A fine conception, brilliant colour, and admirable drawing invested these paintings with a unique charm which we can only faintly realise in their present ruined condition. In addition to decorative designs "as varied and graceful as they are fanciful" and "executed with masterly skill", they depict sacred objects and symbols, the figures of Buddha, and the incidents of his life (including past lives described in the *Jātaka* stories). Those known as "The Dying Princess", "The Mother and Child", etc., have won the highest admiration. The fresco-paintings at Sīgiriya in Ceylon, executed towards the close of the fifth century A.D., show a close resemblance to those of Ajantā and are in a better state of preservation. Some fresco paintings of high merit also adorn the caves at Bāgh.

Compared with sculpture, Gupta architecture, to judge by the extant remains, must be regarded as poor. The stone temple at Sāñchī, like that at Deogarh, is very small, but exhibits refinement in style. The brick temple at Bhītargāon is large but ruined. Remains of stone temples of this period have also been found at Nachna-ke-Talai and other places. These temples are well-designed, and consist of a square chamber, a cella (shrine), and a portico or veranda as essential elements. They are decorated with fine sculptured panels, but the decoration is properly subordinated to, and is in full harmony with, the architectural plan of the buildings. There is no doubt that magnificent temples of large dimensions were constructed during the Gupta age, but they have been completely destroyed. High and elaborately-worked towers (*śikharas*) which surmounted the roofs of temples in later ages, had not yet made their appearance, but the beginnings of this development are seen in the Bhītargāon temple and the miniature representations of temples on relief-sculptures of the Gupta period.

The artistic excellence of the Gupta period also found expression in the rich variety of gold coins issued by the wealthiest and mightiest monarchs of the age. According to some scholars, foreign influence is clearly traceable in this series, but the engravers who produced them were no mere imitators of the work of others. They gave free and spontaneous expression to their own ideas, and skilfully assimilated alien models with their own national tradition. The masterly execution of these coins is only matched by the elegance of their design, and they are justly regarded as among the finest examples of Indian art.

The Medieval Period (A.D. 600–1200)

During the six hundred years that followed the Gupta age, architecture gradually assumed the more important rôle in the evolution of Indian art. It was during this age that the different styles of architecture were evolved and led to the construction of the magnificent temples which we see to-day all over India.

Broadly speaking, there were two important styles of architecture,—Indo-Aryan or North-Indian, and Dravidian or South-Indian. The difference lies mainly in the shape of the *śikhara* or the high tower-like superstructure which now almost universally surmounts the cella or the shrine containing the image of the deity. The North Indian *śikhara* (see illustration on p. 238) has the appearance of a solid mass of curvilinear tower, bulging in the middle and ending in almost a point. The South Indian *śikhara* (see p. 242) looks like a pyramid made up of successive storeys each smaller than, and receding a little from, the one beneath it. This also ended in a small round piece of stone as its crowning member. Both types of *śikharas* were minutely carved with decorative sculptures.

There is another essential difference between the two styles of architecture. In South Indian temples pillars play an important part while they are altogether absent in edifices constructed in the North Indian style.

North India

Temples with curvilinear *śikharas* are found all over Northern India, and there are large groups of them at Bhuvanesvar in Orissa, and Khajurāho in the State of Chattarpur in Central India. Many of these temples are covered with sculpture from top to bottom, and present a grand and magnificent appearance. Infinite charm and variety are introduced in the *śikhara* by suitable modification of forms and application of sculptures, without destroying its essential characteristics. In the Khajurāho temples, as in most later examples, miniature *śikharas* are used as decorative ornaments on the body of the *śikhara* (see p. 239), and, in course of time, these decorative *śikharas* are developed into small independent *śikharas*, round about the central one.

It is impossible to describe in detail any one of these temples. The Lingarāja temple and the Rājarānī temple at Bhuvanesvar, and some of the temples erected by the Chandella kings at Khajurāho, may be regarded as the finest specimens of earlier and later types. The temple of Jagannāth at Purī, though more famous,

is less beautiful. There are also a good many fine temples in Rājputāna.

In addition to the normal type, independent styles were developed in certain localities, notably Kāshmīr and Rājputāna. The Mārtand temple is a good specimen of the former. As to the latter, the two temples at Dilāvarā on Mount Abu deserve special mention. They are small in dimension and not crowned by *śikharas*. But the dome which covers the shrine and the pillars of the *maṇḍapa* in front are worked with an elegance and refinement which defy all descrip-

E.N.A.

LINGARĀJA TEMPLE, BHUVANESVAR

tion. The hard stone is worked as if it were a fragile substance like paper. The rich exuberance of their decoration displays almost superhuman skill and entitles them to rank as priceless treasures of art. One of these was erected by a minister or governor named Vimala Shā in A.D. 1032 and the other by Tejaḥpāla in A.D. 1231.

South India

The history of architecture and sculpture in the South Indian Peninsula begins with the Pallava temples, and here, for the first

time, we meet with the Dravidian style. In addition to the temples in the capital city, Kāñchī or Conjeeveram, and other places, some of the rock-cut temples, known as the seven Pagodas

Photo, Johnston & Hoffmann

MAHĀDEVA TEMPLE, KHAJURĀHO

or *Rathas* of Māmallapuram, are built in this style which may therefore be justly called the Pallava style. The latter are small temples, each of which is cut out of a single big rock-boulder. They lie near the sea-beach and adorned the town called Māmallapuram or Mahābalipuram, founded by the great Pallava

king, Narasiṁhavarman (seventh century A.D.) It is now an insignificant place, and its only attraction is provided by these wonderful monolithic temples and a series of fine sculptures on rock-walls (see p. 241). The temples or pagodas are named after the five Pāṇḍava brothers and their common spouse Draupadī (Dharmarājarath, Bhīm-ratha, Draupadī-ratha, etc.). These monolithic temples, wrought out of massive stone, are complete with all the details of an ordinary temple and stand to-day as an undying

TEJAḤPĀLA'S TEMPLE, MOUNT ABU

testimony to the superb quality of Pallava art. Among the sculptures, one large composition has obtained great celebrity. The scene represented is usually described as the penance of Arjuna, but this is very doubtful. There are also many rock-cut caves belonging to the Pallava period.

It is important to note that the earliest specimens of Pallava art already exhibit a fairly advanced stage of development. Although we have no remains of an earlier epoch, we must presume its existence. For the men who built the temples at Kāñchī or Māmallapuram, or wrought the sculptures on the rocks at the

latter place, were no novices in their art, and must have been trained in schools with art traditions of centuries and generations at their back. The problem is analogous to that offered by the finished art of the Maurya period, and its probable solution has been discussed above. But the theory that foreign artists were imported to do the work can hardly be maintained in this case. We must hold, therefore, that earlier artists mostly worked in wood or other perishable materials, and hence their work has

Copyright Klein and Peyer

ROCK-CUT SCULPTURE, MĀMALLAPURAM

entirely disappeared; though chance or luck might some day restore a few relics of it.

The style of Pallava architecture not only set the standard in the South Indian Peninsula, but also largely influenced the architecture of the Indian colonies in the Far East. The characteristic Pallava or Dravidian type of *śikhara* is met with in the temples of Java, Cambodia, and Vietnam. But there are important differences between them and the South Indian temples. The pillars which form such an important adjunct to the latter are altogether absent in the former.

The Cholas who supplanted the Pallavas in South India were mighty builders. The Dravidian style was developed and almost

perfected under them. Perhaps the best example of this style is furnished by the great Śaiva temple at Tanjore built by Rājarāja the Great. The great *śikhara*, consisting of fourteen storeys, rises to a height of 190 feet and is crowned by a massive dome consisting of a

E.N.A

TANJORE TEMPLE

single block of stone. It is said that this huge block was carried to the immense height by being rolled along an inclined road, about four miles long, specially built for this purpose. The massive building is covered from the base to the top with sculptures and decorative mouldings. It occupies the centre of a courtyard with other

subsidiary chapels, but the whole area is dominated by the high tower over the shrine which is a conspicuous landmark in the locality.

There was another massive temple at Gangaikoṇḍa-cholapuram, the new capital city built by Rājendra Chola in the Trichinopoly district. The city was also adorned with a magnificent palace and a vast artificial lake, with stone embankment, more than fifteen miles long. All these are now in ruins.

Chola art is characterised by a massive grandeur. The huge structures were decorated with minute sculptures involving immense labour and infinite pains. As Fergusson very aptly remarked, the Chola artists conceived like giants and finished like jewellers.

A new development was slowly taking place in Chola art which was destined to modify Dravidian architecture in later times. This was the addition of a huge gateway, called a *Gopuram*, to the enclosure of the temple. Gradually, the Gopurams came to be multiplied and assumed huge proportions, being composed, like the temple itself, of a large number of superimposed storeys. Ultimately the gigantic Gopurams, sometimes large in number, came to occupy the dominant place by their towering height and lavish decoration, while the central shrine, being far less imposing, was reduced to comparative insignificance. The Gopuram at Kumbhakonam, for example, is a very splendid piece of work, by itself, but it so completely overshadows the main shrine that the structure, taken as a whole, is less pleasing and produces far less artistic effect than might have been reasonably expected.

There are many massive temples in South India, built in the same style. In addition to Gopurams, pillared halls and long colonnades were added as new features in the later temples. Modern travellers are struck with awe by the sight of the gigantic temples at Madurā, Śrīrangam, Rāmeśvaram, and other places, with successive enclosures, long courts with a bewildering maze of buildings, thousand-pillared halls, and long vistas of covered colonnades which seem to fade into the distance. But most of these temples are of a much later period.

The Upper Deccan

Between North India and the Far South, which had evolved two independent styles of architecture, lay the Deccan plateau where both the styles in pure or slightly modified form, known as Chālukya style, were in use. The Chālukyas and the Rāshṭrakūṭas who ruled in this region were great builders. Near the Chālukya capital, Bādāmi, we find a number of cave-temples which are

dedicated to Brāhmaṇical gods, and contain a number of fine images and good sculptures. There are also many stone temples at Bādāmi and various other places constructed in the ordinary way. Most of these show the Pallava or Dravidian style. The same style was also largely adopted by the Rāshṭrakūṭas, and the world-famous Kailāsa Temple at Ellorā is a marvellous specimen of the Dravidian style. It was constructed during the reign of Kṛishṇa I, in the latter half of the eighth century A.D. The process of construction employed in the case of the Māmallapuram *Rathas* was repeated here on a much bigger scale. An entire hillside was first demarcated and separated from a long range of mountains; and then a huge temple was cut out of it in the same way as each *Ratha* at Māmallapuram was cut out of a rock-boulder. The big temple, standing in an open court, now appears like an ordinary one, but it is merely the remnant of a solid mass of stone that once formed a part of the hill which now surrounds the temple on three sides.

The temple has a Dravidian *śikhara* and is elaborately carved with fine sculptures. Caves, excavated in the sides of the hills round it, contain big halls decorated with finely wrought pillars and images of various Brāhmaṇical divinities. The Kailāsa temple at Ellorā is a splendid achievement of art, and considering the technical skill and labour involved, is unequalled in the history of the world.

The hill at Ellorā contains a number of rock-cut caves within a short distance of the famous temple. The caves generally resemble those of the earlier period at Nāsik and Kārle, but the *façade* of the Viśvakarmā cave shows a pleasing modification.

The caves on the island of Elephanta, near Bombay, are also renowned and contain a number of large and remarkable images of Brāhmaṇical gods.

The Mysore Plateau

The Hoysalas who succeeded the later Chālukyas and ruled over the Mysore plateau in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries A.D. evolved a new style of architecture. They perhaps inherited the art-traditions of their predecessors, the Gaṅgas, during whose rule the famous colossal Jaina image of Gomata was constructed by Chāmunda Ray, a minister, in about A.D. 983. The statue, placed on the top of a hillock at Śravaṇa Belgola, is more than 56 feet high, i.e. about ten times the size of a human being. It is wrought out of a single block of stone of the hardest species. In boldness of conception and difficulty of execution, it has perhaps no rival among the sculptures of the world.

The Hoysalas displayed the same qualities, though in a different way, in the construction of their temples. These temples are not square but polygonal or star-shaped. The essential characteristics of these temples are the high bases or plinths which follow all the windings of the temple and thus offer a huge length of vacant space to be elaborately carved with sculptures. The *śikhara* is pyramidal but low, and may be regarded as a modified type of the Dravidian. The best-known example of the Hoysala style is the famous Hoysaleśvara temple at Halebid or Dorasamudra. It



E.N.A.

HOYSALEŚVARA TEMPLE, HALEBID

stands on a terrace, about five or six feet high, paved with stone slabs. The entire height is covered with a succession of eleven running friezes of elephants, tigers, scrolls, horsemen, and celestial beasts and birds. Each frieze has a length of 700 feet or more, and the entire surface is covered with sculptures. The lowest frieze, for example, contains no less than two thousand elephants finely executed, and most of them with riders and trappings. Similar elaboration of decoration is found in the remaining ten friezes. The Hoysaleśvara temple contains, as has been aptly remarked, "one of the most marvellous exhibitions of human labour to be found even in the patient East".

Medieval Sculptures

The medieval sculptures may best be studied with reference to the temples which they adorn. There were, besides, isolated images of gods and goddesses, in considerable numbers. There were many local schools with distinctive characteristics, fostered by different ruling dynasties (e.g. Pālas, Senas, Chandellas, Kalachuris). It is neither possible nor necessary to refer in detail to these numerous schools spread all over India. The medieval sculptures are gradually dominated more and more by religious influence and less by aesthetic ideas. Sometimes they seem ugly and even horrible to the modern eye, though they represent faithfully some religious concept. The conception of Naṭarāja Śiva is one of the few valuable contributions of medieval art, especially in South India. In North India we come across both Buddhist and Brāmaṇical images of a fairly high standard, but there is hardly any original conception. In the later period they are influenced by Tāntrik ideas which are not always very pleasing to the modern taste.

Art in ancient India has in the main been a handmaid of religion. It has ordinarily expressed the prevailing religious faiths and beliefs, and spiritual conceptions and emotions. To understand and appreciate it properly one must have a thorough understanding of the different phases of religious evolution. In earlier periods, however, there was more of really artistic spirit, and the religious ideas were also more compatible with modern aesthetic taste. Gradually there was a decline in artistic feeling and the artists were mere mechanical instruments in rendering, to order, the later concepts of religion.

Medieval Painting

The ceilings of the rock-cut temple at Kailāsa and the adjoining caves contain pictures of a type and style different from those of Ajantā and Bāgh. The cave temple at Sittannavasal in Pudukottai (Madras) contains some fine paintings of the time of the Pallava king Mahendravarman. Chola paintings of the eleventh century A.D. have been discovered in the great temple at Tanjore. The art of painting in later periods is mostly known from illuminations on palm-leaves of manuscripts found in Eastern India and Gujarāt, but they are of much inferior quality.

Conclusion

A review of the progress and development of Indian art, such as we have attempted above, is necessary for the proper under-

standing of the high culture and refinement of the ancient Indians. For true art is an unerring expression of mind, and a national art is a true reflex of national character. Great nations of the world have left behind them unmistakable evidence of their greatness in their works of art. The nature and excellence of art constitute a sure means by which we can understand the essential characteristics of a nation and make a fair estimate of its greatness. Judged by the standard of art, Indian civilisation must be regarded as occupying a very high place indeed among those of antiquity. It exhibits not only grace and refinement but technical skill and patient industry of a very high order. Taken in a mass, Indian art offers the most vivid testimony to the wonderful resources in men and money possessed by the rulers, and the religious spirit, occasionally reaching to a sublime height, that dominated the entire population. It shows, as the national ideal, the subordination of ideas of physical beauty and material comfort to ethical conceptions and spiritual bliss. Amid the luxuries and comforts of worldly life, the thought of the world beyond never ceased to exercise a dominant influence. The changes in spiritual ideas and ideals, from the sublime purity of early Buddhism to the less pleasing forms of the Tāntrik cult, are also reflected in art. A more detailed study of the subject is beyond the scope of the present work, but its meaning and significance for the correct interpretation of ancient Indian life must be clearly grasped by every student of History.

GENEALOGICAL TABLES TO PART I

THE MAURYAS



THE EARLY GUPTAS



HOUSE OF PUSHYABHUTI



THE IMPERIAL PRATIHĀRAS



THE PĀLAS OF BENGAL AND THE GĀHADAVĀLAS



THE SENAS OF BENGAL



EARLY CHĀLUKYA KINGS



EASTERN CHĀLUKYA DYNASTY



THE RĀSHṬRAKŪṬA DYNASTY



CHĀLUKYA DYNASTY OF KALYĀNA

Vijayāditya (696–733)

Bhīma I

Kīrttivarman III

Tailapa, or Taila I

Vikramāditya III

Bhīma II

Ayyana I

Vikramāditya IV
Md. Bonthādevi, dau. of the Chedi king Lakshmaṇa

1. Tailapa or Taila II. 'Āhavamalla'.
Md. Jākavve, dau. of a Rāshṭrakūṭa king. A.D. 973–997

2. Satyāsraya, Irivabedaṅga.
A.D. 997–1008

Daśavarman
or Yaśovarman

3. Vikramāditya V
A.D. 1008–1014

4. Ayyana II
1014–1015

5. Jayasiṁha II
'Jagadekamalla'
A.D. 1015–1042

6. Someśvara I
'Āhavamalla'
A.D. 1042–1068

Dau. Hanmā or Āvallā-devī
Md. Yādava Chief Bhillama
III of Seuna-deśa

7. Someśvara II
'Bhuvanaikamalla'
1068–1076

8. Vikramāditya VI
'Tribhuvanamalla'
1076–1127

Jayasiṁha

Vishṇuvardhana
Vijayāditya

Jayakarṇa
'Trailokyamalla'

9. Someśvara III
'Bhulokamalla'
1127–1138

Dau. Mailāla-devī.
Md. Jayakeśin II of
the Kadambas of Goa.

10. Perma, Jagadekamalla II
1138–1151

11. Tailapa III
'Nurmadi Taila', 'Trailokyamalla'
1151–1156. Died 1163

12. Someśvara IV
'Tribhuvanamalla'
1184–1200

PALLAVA KINGS

Siṁhavarman IV
|
Vishṇugopa III
|
Siṁhavarman V
|

Siṁhavishṇu	Bhīmavarman
Mahendravarman I	Buddhavarman
Narasiṁhavarman I *c.* 642–668	Ādityavarman
Mahendravarman II	Govindavarman
Parameśvaravarman I *c.* 674	Hiraṇyavarman
Narasiṁhavarman II	Nandivarman II Ruled for at least 65 years in the eighth century
Parameśvaravarman II	Mahendravarman III
	Dantivarman Vanquished by Rāshtrakūṭa Govinda III (793–814)
	Nandivarman III (Kampa?) Md. Śaṅkhā, dau. of Rāshṭrakūṭa Amoghavarsha I
	Nṛipatuṅga
	Aparājita Crushed by the Chola King Āditya I in the last quarter of the ninth century A.D.

CHOLA KINGS


Vijayālaya
Seized Tanjore.
c. 846–871
Āditya I
c. 871–907
Parāntaka I
A.D. 907–953
Rājāditya I
947–949
Gaṇḍarāditya
949–957
Madurāntaka Uttama
969–985
Arinjaya
956–957
Parāntaka II
'Sundara Chola'
956–973
Āditya II, or
'Karikāla II'
956–969
Rājarāja I
'Mummadi-Chola',
'Nurmadi-Chola',
'Arumoli-deva',
985–1016
Rājendra I
'Pandita-Chola',
'Mudikoṇḍa Chola',
'Gangaikoṇḍa-Chola',
'Nigarili-Chola'. 1012–1044
Dau. Kundavvā
Md. E. Chalukya
king Vimalāditya.
Dau. Ammangadevi
Md. Rājarāja I
E. Chālukya
Rājādhirāja I
'Jayamkoṇḍa Chola'
Yuvarāja 1018–1044
King 1044–1054
Rājendradeva II
1052–1064
Vīrarājendra
1063–1069
Rājamahendra
1060–1063
Dau. Madhurāntaki
Md. E. Chālukya
Rājendra III,
Kulottuṅga I
Adhi-rājendra,
1067–1070
Dau. md. Vikra-
māditya VI of
Kalyāna
Rājendra III
Kulottuṅga Chola I
1070–1122
Rājarāja
Viceroy of
Veṅgi
Mummadi-Chola
Viceroy of
Veṅgi
Vīra Chola
Viceroy of
Veṅgi
Vikrama-Chola
1118–1135
Kulottuṅga Chola II
1133–1150
Rājarāja II
1146–1173
Cousin
Rājādhirāja II
1163–1179
Successors
Kulottuṅga III
1178–1218
Rājarāja III
1216–1246
Rājendra IV
1246–1279

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO PART I

Chapter I

Ancient Geography of India—Cunningham.
Bhuvanakosa section of the Purānas.
Cambridge History of India, Vol. I.
Census of India, 1931, Vol. I.
Fundamental Unity of India—R. K. Mookerji.
Imperial Gazetteer of India, the Indian Empire, Vol. I, XXVI.
Studies in Indian Antiquities—Raychaudhuri.

Chapter II

Early India and Pakistan—Sir Mortimer Wheeler.
Excavations at Harappa—M. S. Vats.
The Harappa Culture and the West—Dr. Heinz Mode.
Indus Civilisation—Ernest Mackay.
The Indus Civilization—Sir Mortimer Wheeler.
Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilisation—Sir John Marshall.
Pragaitihāsika Mohenjo-Daro (in Bengali), Calcutta University—K. Goswami.
Prehistoric India—Stuart Piggott.
Script of Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro—G. R. Hunter.

Chapter III

Ancient India—R. C. Majumdar.
Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, Chapters III and IV.
Hindu Public Life, Vol. I—Choshal.
History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature—Max Müller.
History of Indian Literature, Vol. I—Winternitz.
Life in Ancient India—P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar.
Original Sanskrit Texts—Muir.
Orion—B. G. Tilak.
Religion and Philosophy of the Veda—Keith.
Rig-Veda—Kaegi.
Rig-Veda Samhita (Translated by R. C. Dutt).
Rig-Veda Samhita (Translated by Wilson).
Sanskrit Literature—Macdonell.
Vedic Age (History and Culture of the Indian People, Vol. I)—edited by R. C. Majumdar and A. D. Pusalker.

Vedic Index—Macdonell and Keith.
Vedic Mythology—Macdonell.

Chapter IV

Aitareya Āranyaka—Keith.
Aitareya Brāhmana—Translated by M. Haug.
Atharva Veda Samhitā.
Atharvaveda (Translation)—Bloomfield.
Brihadāranyaka Upanishad.
Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, Chapter V.
Chhāndogya Upanishad.
Early History of the Vaishnava Sect—Raychaudhuri.
History of Indian Literature, Vol. I—Winternitz.
Hymns of the Atharvaveda Translated—Griffith.
Life in Ancient India—P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar.
Religion and Philosophy of the Veda—Keith.
Sāma Veda Samhitā.
Sanskrit Literature—Macdonell.
Satapatha Brāhmana. (Sacred Books of the East).
Texts of the White Yajurveda Translated—Griffith.
Translation of the Samhitā of the Sāma Veda—Stevenson.
Vedic Index—Macdonell and Keith.
Vedic Mythology—Macdonell.
Yajurveda Samhitā.

Chapter V

Buddhist India—Rhys Davids.
Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, Chapters VI, VII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI.
Dialogues of the Buddha—Rhys Davids.
Dynasties of the Kali Age—Pargiter.
Early History of India—V. Smith.
Invasion of India by Alexander the Great—M'Crindle.
Mahāvamsa—Geiger.
Old Persian Inscriptions of the Achaemenian Emperors—Sukumar Sen.
Political History of Ancient India—Raychaudhuri.
Vinaya Texts—Rhys Davids and Oldenberg.

Chapter VI

Agrarian System of Ancient India—Ghoshal.
Ancient India as Described in Classical Literature—M'Crindle

Bodhāyana Dharmasutra.
Buddha—Oldenberg.
Buddhist India—Rhys Davids
Buddhist Suttas.
Buddhistic Studies—B. C. Law.
Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, Chapters VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XVI.
The Classical Accounts of India—R. C. Majumdar
Corporate Life in Ancient India—R. C. Majumdar.
Dialogues of the Buddha.
Early History of the Vaishnava Sect—Raychaudhuri.
Epic Mythology—Hopkins.
Gautama Dharmasāstra.
Great Epic of India—Hopkins.
Heart of Jainism—Sinclair Stevenson.
Hindu Law and Custom—Jolly.
Hindu Polity—Jayaswal.
Hinduism and Buddhism, 3 vols.—Sir Charles Eliot.
History of Indian Literature—Winternitz.
History of Pali Literature—B. C. Law.
Indian Antiquities—Barnett.
Indo-Aryan Races—Chanda.
Jātakas.
Life of Buddha—E. J. Thomas.
Local Government in Ancient India—R. K. Mookerji.
Mahābhārata.
Manual of Indian Buddhism—Kern.
Oxford History of India—V. Smith.
Political History of Ancient India—Raychaudhuri.
Rāmāyana.
Social Organisation in North-East India—Fick.
Social and Military Position of the Ruling Caste in Ancient India—Hopkins.
Studies in Indian Antiquities—Raychaudhuri.
Theism in Medieval India—Carpenter.
Vaisnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems—Sir R. G. Bhandarkar.
Vasishtha Dharmasutra.
Vinaya Texts.

Chapter VII

The Age of Imperial Unity—Edited by R. C. Majumdar.
Age of the Nandas and Mauryas—Edited by K. A. N. Sastri.
Asoka—D. R. Bhandarkar.

Asoka—R. K. Mookerji.
Asoka—V. Smith.
Asoka Edicts in New Light—B. M. Barua.
Asoka Inscriptions—B. M. Barua. Also—R. G. Basak and D. R. Pandeya.
Bhavishyānukirtan section of the Purānas.
Buddhist India—Rhys Davids.
Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, Chapters XVIII, XX.
Carmichael Lectures, 1923.
Chandragupta Maurya and His Times—R. K. Mookerji.
A Comprehensive History of India, Vol. II—Edited by K. A. N. Sastri.
Early History of India—V. Smith.
Inscriptions of Asoka—Hultzsch.
Political History of Ancient India—H. C. Raychaudhuri.

Chapter VIII

Ancient History of the Deccan—Jouveau Dubreuil.
Beginnings of South Indian History—S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar.
Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, Chapters XVII, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV.
Catalogue of Indian Coins (Ancient India)—Allan.
Catalogue of Indian Coins (Andhras, Western Kshatrapas, etc.)—Rapson.
Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum—Smith.
Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India—Gardner.
Dynasties of the Kali Age—Pargiter.
Early History of the Deccan—Sir R. G. Bhandarkar.
Early History of India—V. Smith.
Greeks in Bactria and India—Tarn.
Guide to Sanchi—Marshall.
Guide to Taxila—Marshall.
Indo-Greek Coins—Whitehead.
The Indo-Greeks—A. K. Narain.
Kharoshthi Inscriptions—Sten Konow.
Notes on the Indo-Scythians—Sylvain Levi.
Political History of Ancient India—Raychaudhuri.
Scythian Period—Johanna Engelberta Van Lohuizen de Leeuw.
Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago—V. Kanakasabhai Pillai.
Udayagiri Khandagiri Cave Inscriptions—Barua.

Chapter IX

Ancient India (M'Crindle's Translation)—Ptolemy.
Ancient India as described in Classical Literature—M'Crindle.
Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian—M'Crindle.
Arthasāstra—Kautilya.
Asoka—D. R. Bhandarkar.
Asoka—Smith.
Cambridge History of India, Vol. I.
Catalogue of Indian Coins (Andhras, Western Kshatrapas, etc.)—Rapson.
The Classical Accounts of India—R. C. Majumdar.
Early History of Bengal—Monahan.
Hindu Political Theories—Ghoshal.
Hindu Revenue System—Ghoshal.
History of Dharmaśāstra—Kane.
History of Indian Literature—Winternitz.
History of Sanskrit Literature—Keith.
India in the Time of Patanjali—B. N. Puri.
Indo-Greek Coins—Whitehead.
Inscriptions of Asoka—Hultzsch.
Mānava Dharmasāstra.
Manual of Indian Buddhism—Kern.
Periplus of the Erythraean Sea.
Political History of Ancient India—Raychaudhuri.
Sanskrit Drama—Keith.
Social Life in Ancient India—S. Chattopadhyaya.

Chapter X

Age of the Imperial Guptas—R. D. Banerji.
Ancient History of the Deccan—Jouveau-Dubreuil.
Buddhist Records of the Western World—Beal.
Catalogue of Indian Coins (Gupta Dynasties)—Allan.
The Classical Age—Edited by R. C. Majumdar.
The Decline of the Kingdom of Magadha—B. P. Sinha.
Early History of India—Smith.
History of North-Eastern India—Basak.
Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings—Fleet.
New History of the Indian People, Vol. VI. Edited by R. Majumdar and A. S. Altekar.
On Yuan Chwang—Watters.

Political History of Ancient India—Raychaudhuri.
Travels of Fa-Hien.

Chapter XI

Bānglār Itihāsa—R. C. Majumdar.
Dynastic History of Northern India—H. C. Ray.
Early History of the Andhra Country—K. Gopalachari.
Early History of India—Smith.
Gauda Lekha Mālā—A. K. Maitreya.
Gauda Rājamālā—R. P. Chanda.
Gurjara-Pratihāras—R. C. Majumdar.
Harsha-Charita—Bāna.
Harsha—R. K. Mookerji.
A History of the Early Dynasties of Andhradesa—B. V. Krishnarao.
History of India as told by her own Historians, Vol. I—Elliot
History of Kanauj—R. S. Tripathi.
A History of Kashmir—P. N. K. Bamzai.
Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings—Fleet.
On Yuan Chwang—Watters.
Political History of Ancient India—Raychaudhuri.
Rājatarangini.

Chapter XII

Early History of the Deccan—Sir R. G. Bhandarkar.
Foreign Notices of South India—Nilakanta Sastri.
Historical Inscriptions of Southern India—Sewell and Aiyangar.
A History of South India—K. A. N. Sastri.
Pallavas—Dubreuil.
Rāshtrakutas and their Times—Altekar.
Successors of the Sātavahanas—D. C. Sircar.

Chapters XIII and XIV

The Age of Imperial Kanauj—Edited by R. C. Majumdar.
Ancient India—S. K. Aiyangar.
Arab Invasions of India—R. C. Majumdar.
Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I.
Caste in India—Senart.
Caste System of Northern India—Blunt.
Census of India, 1931.
Chaulukyas of Gujarat—A. K. Majumdar.
Cholas, The—Nilakanta Sastri.
Dynastic History of Northern India—H. C. Ray.
Early History of Bengal—Girindramohan Sarkar.

Early History of Kamrup—K. L. Barua.
The Economic History of Northern India—Dr. Pushpa Niyogi.
Historical Inscriptions of Southern India—Sewell and Aiyangar.
History of Assam—Gait.
History of Bengal, Vol. I—R. C. Majumdar.
History of the Candellas—N. S. Bose.
History of the Gāhadavāla Dynasty—Roma Niyogi.
History of India as told by her own Historians, Vols. I, II—Elliot.
History of Kanauj—R. S. Tripathi.
History of Orissa—R. D. Banerji.
History of the Paramāras—D. C. Ganguli.
History of Sanskrit Literature—Keith.
Hymns of the Ālvars—Hooper.
Hymns of the Tamil Saivite Saints—Kingsbury and Phillips.
India (Sachau)—al-Beruni.
Inscriptions of Bengal—N. G. Majumdar.
Kāmarupasāsanavali—Padmanath Bhattacharya.
Land System and Feudalism in Ancient India—Edited by D. C. Sircar.
Life and Times of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazna—Nazim.
Nepal—Percival Landon.
Origin and Early History of Saivism in South India—C. V. Narayan Iyer.
Origin and Growth of Caste in India—Dutt.
Outline of the Religious Literature of India—Farquha.
Pandyan Kingdom—Nilakanta Sastri.
Rājatarangini—Kalhana.
Rajputana Gazetteer.
Rāmacharita—Sandhyākara Nandi.
The Socio-Economic History of Northern India—B. P. Mazumdar.
The Struggle for Empire—Edited by R. C. Majumdar.
Studies in Tamil Literature and History—Dikshitar.
Theism in Medieval India—Carpenter.
Travels—Marco Polo.
Unavimsa-samhitā edited by Panchanan Tarkaratna.
Vaishnavism, Saivaism and Minor Religious Systems—Sir R. G. Bhandarkar.
Vaishnavite Reformers of India—T. Rajagopala Chariar.
Vikramānkadevacharita—Bilhana.
The Wonder that was India—A. L Basham.

Chapter XV

Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East—R. C. Majumdar.
Vol. I.—Champā.
Vol. II.—Suvarnadvipa.
Ancient Indian Colonisation in South-East Asia—R. C. Majumdar.
Hindu Colonies in the Far East—R. C. Majumdar.
Hinduism and Buddhism, Vol. II—Eliot.
India and Central Asia—P. C. Bagchi.
India and the Western World—H. G. Rawlinson.
Indian Cultural Influence in Cambodia—B. R. Chatterji.
Indian Influences on the Literature of Java and Bali—H. Sarkar.

Chapter XVI

Beginnings of Buddhist Art—A. Foucher.
Cambridge History of India, Vol. I.
History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon—V. A. Smith.
History of Indian and Indonesian Art—A. K. Coomarswamy.
History of Indian and Eastern Architecture (Edited by J. Burgess and R. P. Spiers)—J. Fergusson.
Indian Architecture—Percy Brown.
Indian Sculpture—Stella Kramrisch.
A Survey of Indian Sculpture—S. K. Saraswati.

GENERAL

Cambridge History of India, Vol. I.
History and Culture of the Indian People, published by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, Vols. I–V.
Dynastic History of Northern India—H. C. Ray.
Ancient India—R. C. Majumdar.
Political History of Ancient India—H. C. Raychaudhuri.
Early History of India—V. A. Smith.

PART II

MEDIEVAL INDIA

Book I

THE MUSLIM CONQUEST AND THE DELHI SULTĀNATE

CHAPTER I

THE ADVENT OF THE MUSLIMS

The Arabs in Sind

We have seen in a previous chapter how the Arabs, roused to energy and enthusiasm by a new creed, effected the conquest of Sind and carried on operations in some of the neighbouring provinces.

With the decline of the Caliphs or Khalifahs of Baghdād, supreme leaders and rulers of the greater part of the Islamic world, the Muslim governor of Sind became virtually independent. In A.D. 871 the Khalifah practically handed over the province to the famous Saffarid leader, Ya'qūb-ibn-Lais. On the latter's death, the Muslim territories in Sind were divided between two independent chiefs, those of Mansurah (near Bahmanābād) and Multān. Neither of these ever attained to great power, and both had to live in constant dread of their Indian neighbours, particularly the Imperial Pratihāras of Kanauj.

The Arab conquest of Sind did not immediately produce any far-reaching political effect, and it has been described by Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole as "an episode in the history of India and of Islam, a triumph without results". But it is significant from the cultural point of view. Besides helping the exchange of ideas, it facilitated the dissemination of the seeds of Indian culture in foreign lands. The Arabs acquired from the Hindus some new knowledge in Indian Religion, Philosophy, Medicine, Mathematics, Astronomy and Folklore, and carried it not only to their own land but also to Europe. We know definitely from Mas'ūdī and Ibn Hauqal that Arab settlers lived side by side with their Hindu fellow-citizens for many years on terms of amity and peace, and Amīr Khusrav mentions that the Arab astronomer Abū Ma'shar came to Benares and studied astronomy there for ten years.

The Ghaznavids : Sultān Mahmūd

From the political point of view, the conquest of the Punjab by the Sultāns of Ghaznī was of far greater importance

than the establishment of Arab principalities in the lower Indus valley.

Sultān Mahmūd, who carried to fruition the policy of his father, Sabuktigīn, was undoubtedly one of the greatest military leaders the world has ever seen. His cool courage, prudence, resourcefulness and other qualities make him one of the most interesting personalities in Asiatic history. In addition to his victorious expeditions in India he had to his credit two memorable campaigns against hostile Turks in the course of which he routed the hosts of Ilak Khān and the Seljuqs. Great as a warrior, the Sultān was no less eminent as a patron of arts and letters.

But in spite of all this, to the historian of India he appears mainly as an insatiable invader. He was neither a missionary for the propagation of religion in this country nor an architect of empire. The main object of his eastern expeditions seems to have been the acquisition of the "wealth of Ind" and the destruction of the morale of its custodians. The annexation of the Punjab was a measure of necessity rather than of choice. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to assume that his invasions had no permanent political results in India. He drained the wealth of the country and despoiled it of its military resources to an appalling extent. The Ghaznavid occupation of the Punjab served as the key to unlock the gates of the Indian interior. Big cracks were made in the great fabric of Indian polity, and it was no longer a question of whether but when that age-old structure would fall. Neither the Arabs nor the Ghaznavid (Yamīnī) Turks succeeded in adding India to the growing empire of Islam, but they paved the way for that final struggle which overwhelmed the Gangetic kingdoms some two hundred years later.

Muhammad of Ghūr

The empire of Ghaznī began to fall to pieces under the later successors of Sultān Mahmūd, who were too feeble to maintain their position at Ghaznī and in North-West India in the face of the rising power of the princes of Ghūr, a small obscure principality in the mountainous region of Afghānistān to the south-east of Herat. The petty chiefs of Ghūr, of eastern Persian extraction, were originally feudatories of Ghaznī, but, taking advantage of the weakness of their suzerains, they steadily rose to power and entered into a contest with them for supremacy. In the course of this contest, Qutb-ud-dīn Muhammad of Ghūr, and his brother Saif-ud-dīn, were cruelly executed by Bahrām Shāh of Ghaznī.

'Alā-ud-dīn Husain, a brother of the victims, took a terrible revenge on Ghaznī by sacking the city and giving it to the flames for seven days and nights. This action earned for 'Alā-ud-dīn the title of *Jahānsūz*, "the world-burner". Bahrām's son and feeble successor, Khusrav Shāh, was driven from Ghaznī by a horde of the Ghuzz tribe of Turkmāns and fled to the Punjab, then the sole remnant of the wide dominions of his ancestors. Ghaznī remained in possession of the Ghuzz Turkmāns for about ten years, after which it was occupied by the princes of Ghūr. Saif-ud-dīn Muhammad, son and successor of the "world-burner", was killed in fighting against the Ghuzz Turkmāns; but his cousin and successor, Ghiyās-ud-dīn Muhammad, drove the Ghuzz Turkmāns from Ghaznī in 1173 and appointed his younger brother, Shihāb-ud-dīn, also known as Mu'iz-ud-dīn Muhammad bin Sām or popularly called Muhammad of Ghūr, governor of that province. Very cordial relations existed between the two brothers, and Muhammad of Ghūr began his Indian campaigns while still a lieutenant of his brother.

The first Indian expedition of Muhammad of Ghūr (A.D. 1175), directed against his co-religionists, the Ismā'īlan heretics of Multān was attended with success, and he soon captured the strong fortress of Uch by a stratagem. But his invasion of Gujarāt in A.D. 1178 proved a failure; the *rājā* of Gujarāt inflicted a terrible defeat on him. Nevertheless, he occupied Peshāwār in the following year and established a fortress at Śiālkoṭ in A.D. 1181. By allying himself with Vijaya Dev, the *rājā* of Jammu, against Khusrav Malik, son and successor of Khusrav Shāh and the last representative of the dynasty of Sabuktigīn and Sultān Mahmūd, then in possession of Lahore only, he captured the Ghaznavid ruler and took him prisoner to Ghaznī. Thus disappeared the rule of the Ghaznavids in the Punjab. Its occupation by Muhammad of Ghūr opened the way for his further conquest of India, which, however, made inevitable a conflict with the Rājputs, particularly with his neighbour, Prithvirāj, the powerful Chauhān king of Ajmer and Delhi.

The political condition of Northern India had changed considerably since the days of Sultān Mahmūd. Though a part of Bihār was in the possession of the Buddhist Pālas, Bengal had passed under the control of the Hindu dynasty of the Senas. Bundelkhand remained under the rule of the Chandellas, but the Pratihāras in Kanauj were displaced by the Gāhaḍavālas. Delhi and Ajmer were under the Chauhāns. Jaichānd or Jayachchandra, the Gāhaḍavāla ruler of Kanauj, who lived mostly at Benares, was considered

by the Muslim writers to be the greatest king of India at the time; and, if Tod is to be believed, he was jealous of Prithvirāj's proud position. His beautiful daughter is said to have been carried away by the Chauhān hero, and the story of this romance has formed the theme of many of the bardic songs of the time. This is said to have added to the bitterness of their relations so that Jaichānd did not ally himself with Prithvirāj when Muhammad of Ghūr appeared on the scene. There is no reason, however, to believe that Jaichānd invited Muhammad of Ghūr to invade India. The invasion of this country was an almost inevitable corollary to Muhammad's complete victory over the Ghaznavids in the Punjab.

When, in the winter of 1190–1191, Muhammad of Ghūr marched beyond the Punjab, Prithvirāj, the bold and chivalrous hero of the Rājputs, who were in no way inferior in bravery and courage to the invaders, advanced to oppose him with a large army, including, according to Ferishta, 200,000 horse and 3,000 elephants. Prithvirāj had the support of many of his fellow Rājput princes, but Jaichānd held aloof. The Ghūrī invader stood in the middle of his army with two wings on two sides and met the Rājputs at Tarāin near Thānesar in A.D. 1191. Fighting with their usual vigour, the Rājputs greatly harassed the Muslim troops, who were soon overpowered, and their leader, being severely wounded, retired to Ghaznī. But Muhammad did not become disheartened at this initial failure. He soon raised a strong army with a view to avenging his defeat, and with adequate preparations, invaded India once again in 1192 and met his Rājput adversary on the same field. By superior tactics and generalship, the invading army inflicted a severe defeat on the Rājputs. Prithvirāj was captured and put to death, and his brother was also slain. This victory of Muhammad was decisive. It laid the foundation of Muslim dominion in Northern India; and the subsequent attempts of the relatives of Prithvirāj to recover their lost power proved to be of no avail. Different parts of Northern India were conquered in the course of a few years by Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak, the most faithful of Muhammad's Turkish officers, and Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn Muhammad.

Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak was originally a slave of Turkestān. In his childhood he was brought by a merchant to Nīshāpūr, where its Qāzī, Fakhr-ud-dīn 'Abdul 'Azīz Kufi, purchased him and provided for his religious and military training along with his sons. After the Qāzī's death, he was sold by the Qāzī's sons to a merchant, who took him to Ghaznī, where he was purchased by Muhammad of Ghūr. Thus Qutb-ud-dīn began his career as a slave, and

the dynasty founded by him in India is known as the "Slave dynasty."[1]

Qutb-ud-dīn was "endowed with all laudable qualities and admirable impressions" though "he possessed no outward comeliness". His qualities gained for him the confidence of Muhammad of Ghūr, who soon raised him to the post of *Amīr-i-Ākhur* (Lord of the stables). He rendered valuable services to his master during his Indian expeditions, in recognition of which he was placed in charge of his Indian conquests after the second battle of Tarāin in 1192. He was left "untrammelled not only in his administration of the new conquests, but also in his discretion to extend them".

To strengthen his own position, Qutb-ud-dīn contracted matrimonial alliances with the powerful rival chiefs; thus while he himself married Tāj-ud-dīn Yildiz's daughter, his sister was married to Nāsir-ud-dīn Qabācha and his daughter to Iltutmish. Qutb-ud-dīn justified the confidence which his master had reposed in him. In 1192 he captured Hānsī, Meerut, Delhi, Ranthambhor and Koīl. In 1194 he helped his master in defeating and slaying Jaichānd, *rājā* of Benares and Kanauj, at Chandwār on the Jumnā in the Etāwah district. In 1197 he chastised Bhīmdev II of Gujarāt, for his having caused him some trouble, plundered his capital and returned to Delhi by way of Hānsī. In 1202 he besieged the fortress of Kālinjar in Bundelkhand, overpowered its defenders and captured vast booty from them. Fifty thousand people, male and female, were made prisoners. He next marched to the city of Mahoba, took possession of it and returned to Delhi by way of Badāūn, one of the richest cities of Hindustān, which also was occupied. Meanwhile, Bihār and a part of Western Bengal had been added to the empire of Ghūr by Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn Muhammad, son of Bakhtiyār Khaljī, who had driven Lakshmaṇa Sena from Nadiā possibly to Eastern Bengal,[2] to a place near Dacca, where the Sena

[1] This description of Qutb-ud-dīn's dynasty is inaccurate. None but three kings (Qutb-ud-dīn, Iltutmish and Balban) of this dynasty were slaves, and even these three were manumitted by their masters. Qutb-ud-dīn received a letter of manumission and a canopy of state from Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn Mahmūd, the nephew and successor of his master, Muhammad of Ghūr, before his elevation to the throne of Delhi (Raverty, *Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī*, pp. 524–5); and Iltutmish was freed before his master (ibid., pp. 605–6). Balban, who belonged to the "forty Turkish slaves of Iltutmish", got his freedom along with them (Ziā Barnī, *Ta'rīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī*). It is also incorrect to describe the dynasty as the "Pathān" or "Afghān" dynasty, because all these rulers were neither "Pathāns" nor "Afghāns" but Turks.

[2] Authorities differ in their opinions regarding the date of the capture of Nadiā by the Muslims. According to Raverty, it was effected in A.H. 905 = A.D. 1193 (op. cit., Vol. I, p. 588 f.n.) but this date was rejected

power survived for more than half a century, and had made Gaur or Lakhnautī, in the modern Māldah district, the seat of his government. Thus by the beginning of the thirteenth century, a considerable part of Hindustān, extending from the Indus in the west to the Ganges in the east, had been conquered by Muslim arms. But the consolidation of Muslim rule required a few years more.

On the death of his elder brother Ghiyās-ud-dīn Muhammad in February, 1203, Mu'iz-ud-dīn Muhammad became the ruler of Ghaznī, Ghūr and Delhi in name, which he had been so long in reality. But soon his position was endangered by some disasters. In 1205 he sustained a defeat near Andkhūī in Central Asia at the hands of 'Alā-ud-dīn Muhammad, the Shāh of Khwārazm, which dealt a severe blow at his military prestige in India and stirred up revolts and conspiracies in different parts of his kingdom. He was refused admittance to Ghaznī; Multān was seized by a Ghaznī officer, and his old enemies, the Khokars, created troubles in the Punjab. But with great zeal and promptitude, Mu'iz-ud-dīn Muhammad marched to India, suppressed the rebellions everywhere, and inflicted a crushing defeat on the Khokars in November, 1205. His days, however, were numbered. On his way from Lahore to Ghaznī, he was stabbed to death at Damyak on the 15th March, 1206, by a band of assassins whose identity has not been precisely determined. Some writers attribute the deed to the Khokars, who had been so recently deprived of their homes, while, according to others, he was killed by some Muslim enthusiasts of the Ismā'īlī sect. A legend of the Rājputs, mentioned also by a Muslim historian, attributes his death to their hero, Prithvirāj, who, according to it, had not been slain at the second battle of Tarāin but was blinded and remained a captive. The body of the murdered Sultān was taken to Ghaznī and buried there.

---

by Blochmann with cogent arguments (*J.A.S.B.*, Pt. I, pp. 275–7). The views of Edward Thomas that Nadiā fell in A.H. 599 = A.D. 1202–1203 (*Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi*, p. 110) and of Charles Stewart (*History of Bengal*, p. 47) that it was captured in A.H. 600 = A.D. 1203–1204 are in conflict with the facts of contemporary history. A recent writer considers the theory of Blochmann that Nadiā was captured in A.H. 594–595 = A.D. 1197–1198, to be "the most plausible one" (*Indian Historical Quarterly*, March 1936, pp. 148–51).

CHAPTER II

THE SO-CALLED SLAVE DYNASTY AND THE CONSOLIDATION OF MUSLIM POWER IN NORTHERN INDIA

1. Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak and Ārām Shāh

MUHAMMAD of Ghūr left no male heirs to succeed him, and his provincial viceroys soon established their own authority in their respective jurisdictions. Tāj-ud-dīn Yildiz, Governor of Kirmān, ascended the throne of Ghaznī, while Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak assumed the title of Sultān and was acknowledged as the ruler of the Indian territories by the Muslim officers in India like Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn of Bengal and Nāsir-ud-dīn Qabācha, Governor of Multān and Uch. Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak's rise excited the jealousy of Tāj-ud-dīn Yildiz, who entered into a contest with him for the mastery over the Punjab. Qutb-ud-dīn defeated Yildiz, drove him out of Ghaznī and occupied it for forty days. But the people of Ghaznī, disgusted with his excesses, secretly invited Yildiz to come to their rescue. Yildiz did not fail to avail himself of this opportunity, and on his sudden and unexpected return to Ghaznī, Qutb-ud-dīn fled away precipitately. This destroyed the chance of a political union between Afghānistān and India, which was not achieved till Bābur's occupation of Delhi, and Qutb-ud-dīn became a purely Indian Sultān. He died at Lahore, early in November, A.D. 1210, in consequence of a fall from his horse while playing *Chaugān* or polo, after a short reign of a little more than four years.

Qutb-ud-dīn was, remarks Minhāj-us-Sirāj, a "high-spirited and open-hearted monarch". Endowed with intrepidity and martial prowess, he rarely lost a battle, and, by his extensive conquests, brought a large part of Hindustān under the banner of Islam. His "gifts were bestowed by hundreds of thousands",[1] and, for his unbounded generosity, he has been styled by all writers as *Lakh bakhsh*, or giver of lacs. Hasan-un-Nizāmī, the author of *Tāj-ul-Ma'āsir* who is full of praise for Qutb-ud-dīn, writes that he "dispensed even-handed justice to the people, and exerted himself to promote the peace and prosperity of the realm". But the

[1] His contemporary, Lakshmana Sena of Bengal, was also known for his lavish generosity.

Sultān felt no hesitation in having recourse to stern measures in his conquests and administration when necessary. His devotion to Islam was remarkable. Thus Hasan-un-Nizāmī remarks: "By his orders the precepts of Islam received great promulgation, and the sun of righteousness cast its shadow on the countries of Hind from the heaven of God's assistance." He gave proof of his zeal by building one mosque at Delhi and another at Ajmer.

On the sudden death of Qutb-ud-dīn at Lahore, the *Amīrs* and *Maliks* of Lahore set up Ārām Bakhsh as his successor with the title of Sultān Ārām Shāh, "for the sake of restraining tumult, for the tranquillity of the commonalty, and the content of the hearts of the soldiery". The relationship of Ārām with Qutb-ud-dīn is a subject of controversy. According to some, he was Qutb-ud-dīn's son, but Minhāj-us-Sirāj distinctly writes that Qutb-ud-dīn only had three daughters. Abul Fazl has made the "astonishing statement" that he was the Sultān's brother. A modern writer has hazarded the opinion that "he was no relation of Qutb-ud-dīn" but was selected as his successor as he was available on the spot.[1] In fact, there were no fixed rules governing the succession to the Crown in the Turkish State. It was determined largely by the exigencies of the moment and the influence of the chiefs and the nobles. Ārām was ill-qualified to govern a kingdom. The nobles of Delhi soon conspired against him and invited Malik Shams-ud-dīn Iltutmish, then Governor of Badāūn, to replace Ārām. Iltutmish responded to their call, and, advancing with all his army, defeated Ārām in the plain of Jūd near Delhi. What became of Ārām is not quite certain.

2. Iltutmish

Iltutmish belonged to the tribe of Ilbarī in Turkestān. He was remarkably handsome in appearance, and showed signs of intelligence and sagacity from his early days, which excited the jealousy of his brothers, who managed to deprive him of his paternal home and care. But adversity did not mar his qualities, which soon opened a career for him. His accomplishments attracted the notice of Qutb-ud-dīn, then Viceroy of Delhi, who purchased him at a high price. By dint of his merits, Iltutmish raised his status step by step till he was made the Governor of Badāūn and was married to a daughter of Qutb-ud-dīn. In recognition of his services during the campaign of Muhammad of Ghūr against the Khokars, he was, by the Sultān's orders, manumitted and elevated as Amīr-ul-Umarā.

[1] *Indian Historical Quarterly*, March, 1937, p. 120.

Thus the choice of the Delhi nobles fell on a worthy man. But on his accession in the year A.D. 1210 or 1211, Iltutmish found himself confronted with an embarrassing situation. Nāsir-ud-dīn Qabācha had asserted his independence in Sind and seemed desirous of extending his authority over the Punjab; and Tāj-ud-dīn Yildiz, who held Ghaznī, still entertained his old pretensions to sovereignty over the Indian conquests of Muhammad. 'Alī Mardān, a Khaljī noble, who had been appointed Governor of Bengal by Qutb-ud-dīn after the death of Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn in A.D. 1206, had thrown off his allegiance to Delhi after Qutb-ud-dīn's death and had styled himself Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn. Further, the Hindu princes and chiefs were seething with discontent at their loss of independence; Gwālior and Ranthambhor had been recovered by their rulers during the weak rule of Ārām Shāh. To add to Iltutmish's troubles, some of the Amīrs of Delhi expressed resentment against his rule.

The new Sultān, however, faced the situation boldly. He first effectively suppressed a rebellion of the Amirs in the plain of Jūd near Delhi, and then brought under his control the different parts of the kingdom of Delhi with its dependencies like Badāūn Oudh, Benares and Siwālik. The ambitious designs of his rivals were also frustrated. In A.D. 1214 Tāj-ud-dīn Yildiz, being driven from Ghaznī by Sultān Muhammad, the Shāh of Khwārazm, fled to Lahore, conquered the Punjab up to Thānesar and tried to establish his independent power and even to assert his authority over Iltutmish. This was what Iltutmish could hardly tolerate. He promptly marched against his rival, and defeated him in a battle fought near Tarāin in January, A.D. 1216. Yildiz was taken prisoner and sent to Badāūn. Nāsir-ud-dīn Qabācha, who had in the meanwhile advanced to Lahore, was expelled from that city by Iltutmish in A.D. 1217. He was completely subdued in February, A.D. 1228, and was accidentally drowned in the Indus, Sind being annexed to the Delhi Sultānate. About a year later, Iltutmish received a robe of honour and a patent of investiture from Al Mustánsir Billah, the reigning Caliph or Khalifah of Baghdād, confirming him in the possession "of all the land and sea which he had conquered" as *Sultān-i-Āzam* (Great Sultān). This added a new element of strength to Iltutmish's authority and gave him a status in the Muslim world. Further, "it fastened the fiction of Khalifat on the Sultānate of Delhi, and involved legally the recognition of the final sovereignty of the Khalifah, an authority outside the geographical limits of India, but inside that vague yet none the less real brotherhood of Islam". On his coins Iltutmish

described himself as the lieutenant of the Caliph. His coins, remarks Thomas, "constituted the veritable commencement of the silver coinage of the Delhi Pathāns".

Meanwhile, Ranthambhor had been recovered by Iltutmish in A.D. 1226 and a year later Mandāwar in the Siwālik hills was captured by him. The Khaljī Maliks of Bengal were reduced to complete submission in the winter of A.D. 1230–1231, and 'Alā-ud-dīn Jānī was appointed Governor of Lakhnautī. Gwālior, which had regained its independence since the death of Qutb-ud-dīn, was recaptured by the Sultān towards the end of A.D. 1232 from its Hindu Rājā, Mangal Deva. The Sultān invaded the kingdom of Mālwa in 1234, and captured the fort of Bhilsa. He next marched to the famous city of Ujjain, which was also captured and sacked. An image of the famous Vikramāditya was carried off to Delhi. The last expedition of Iltutmish was directed against Banian[1], but on his way he was attacked with such a severe illness that he had to be carried back to Delhi in a litter. This disease proved fatal and he expired on the 29th April, 1236, after a reign of twenty-six years.

It was during the reign of Iltutmish, in the year A.D. 1221, that the Mongols appeared for the first time on the banks of the Indus, under their celebrated leader Chingīz Khān. Chingīz was born in A.D. 1155 and his original name was Temuchīn. He was not merely a conqueror. Being trained in the school of adversity during his early days, he developed in himself the virtues of patience, courage and self-reliance, which enabled him to organise in an empire "the barbarous tribal communities of Central Asia and to found laws and institutions which lasted for generations after his death". He overran the countries of Central and Western Asia with lightning rapidity, and when he attacked Jalāl-ud-dīn Mangabarnī, the last Shāh of Khwārazm or Khiva, the latter fled to the Punjab and sought asylum in the dominions of Iltutmish. The Sultān of Delhi refused to comply with the request of his unwelcome guest. Mangabarnī entered into an alliance with the Khokars, and after defeating Nāsir-ud-dīn Qabācha of Multān, plundered Sind and northern Gujarāt and went away to Persia. The Mongols also retired. India was thus saved from a terrible calamity, but the menace of Mongol raids disturbed the Sultāns of Delhi in subsequent times.

[1] Situated, according to Raverty (p. 823, f.n. 8), in the hill tracts, of the Sind-Sāgar Doāb, or in the country immediately west of the Salt Range. Badāūnī (Ranking, Vol I, p. 95), and Ferishta (Briggs, Vol. I, p. 211) borrowing from Nizām-ud-dīn, write Multān, but they are wrong.

Iltutmish may justly be regarded as the greatest ruler of the Early Turkish Sultānate of Delhi, which lasted till A.D. 1290. To him belongs the credit of having saved the infant Muslim dominion in India from disruption and of having consolidated the conquests of Qutb-ud-dīn into a strong and compact monarchy extending at his death over the whole of Hindustān, with the exception of a few outlying provinces. An intrepid warrior and a stern chastiser of foes, he was busy till the last year of his life in military conquests. He was at the same time gifted with brilliant qualities as a man and extended his patronage to arts and letters. The completion of the structure of the famous Qutb Minār at Delhi by the Sultān in A.D. 1231–1232 stands as an imperishable testimony to his greatness. The column was named not after the first Turkish Sultān of Delhi, as some writers wrongly hold, but after Khwāja Qutb-ud-dīn, a native of Ush near Baghdād, who had come to live in Hindustān and was held in much esteem and veneration by Iltutmish and others. It was out of gratitude that Iltutmish caused the names of his patrons, Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn and Sultān Mu'iz-ud-dīn, to be inscribed on it. A magnificent mosque was also built by the Sultān's orders. He was intensely religious and very particular about saying his prayers. "Never has a sovereign," writes Minhāj-us-Sirāj, "so virtuous, kind-hearted and reverent towards the learned and the divines, sat upon the throne." He is described in some contemporary inscriptions as "the protector of the lands of God", "the helper of the servants of God", etc.

3. Raziyya

Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd, the eldest son of Iltutmish, died in April, A.D. 1229, while governing Bengal as his father's deputy. The surviving sons of the Sultān were incapable of the task of administration. Iltutmish, therefore, nominated on his death-bed his daughter Raziyya as his heiress. But the nobles of his court were too proud to bow their heads before a woman, and disregarding the deceased Sultān's wishes, raised to the throne his eldest surviving son, Rukn-ud-dīn Fīrūz, who had been in charge of the government of Badāūn and, after a few years, of Lahore, during his father's lifetime. This was an unfortunate choice. Rukn-ud-dīn was unfit to rule. He indulged in low tastes, neglected the affairs of state, and squandered away its wealth. Matters were made worse by the activities of his mother, Shāh Turkhān, an ambitious woman of humble origin,[1] who seized all power while her son remained

[1] She was originally a Turkish handmaid,

immersed in enjoyment. The whole kingdom was plunged into disorder, and the authority of the central government was set at naught in Badāūn, Multān, Hānsī, Lahore, Oudh and Bengal. The nobles of Delhi, who had been seething with discontent about the undue influence of the queen-mother, made her a prisoner and placed Raziyya on the throne of Delhi. Rukn-ud-dīn Fīrūz, who had taken refuge at Kilokhrī, was also put in prison, where he met his doom on the 9th November, A.D. 1236.

The task before the young queen was not an easy one. Muhammad Junaidī, the *wazīr* of the kingdom, and some other nobles, could not reconcile themselves to the rule of a woman and organised an opposition against her. But Raziyya was not devoid of the virtues necessary in a ruler, and by astuteness and superior diplomacy she soon overpowered her enemies. Her authority was established over Hindustān and the Punjab, and the governors of the distant provinces of Bengal and Sind also acknowledged her sway. Thus, as Minhāj-us-Sirāj has stated, "From Lakhnautī to Debal and Damrilah all the Maliks and Amīrs manifested their obedience and submission". During the early part of Raziyya's reign, an organised attempt to create trouble was made by some heretics of the Qirāmitah and Mulāhidah sects, under the leadership of a Turk named Nūr-ud-dīn. One thousand of them arrived with swords and shields, and entered the Great Mosque on a fixed day, but they were dispersed by the royal troops and the outbreak ended in a ludicrous fiasco.

The queen was not, however, destined to enjoy a peaceful reign. The undue favour shown by her to the Abyssinian slave Jalāl-ud-dīn Yāqūt, who was elevated to the post of master of the stables, offended the Turkish nobles,[1] who were organised in a close corporation. The first to revolt openly was Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn Altūńiya, the governor of Sarhind, who was secretly instigated by some nobles

[1] Ibn Batūtah wrongly states that her "fondness" for the Abyssinian was "criminal". No such allegation is made by the contemporary Muslim chronicler, Minhāj; he simply writes that the Abyssinian "acquired favour in attendance upon the Sultān" (Raverty, Vol. I, p. 642). Ferishta's only allegation against her is that "a very great degree of familiarity was observed to exist between the Abyssinian and the Queen, so much so, that when she rode he always lifted her on horse by raising her up under the arms" (Briggs, Vol. I, p. 220). As Major Raverty has pointed out, Thomas has assailed the character of this princess without just cause in the following terms: "It was not that a virgin Queen was forbidden to love—she might have indulged in a submissive Prince Consort, or revelled almost unchecked in the dark recesses of the Palace Harem, but wayward fancy pointed in a wrong direction, and led her to prefer a person employed about her Court, an Abyssinian moreover, the favours extended to whom the Turkī nobles resented with one accord" (*Chronicles of the Pathan Kings*, p. 106).

of the court. The queen marched with a large army to suppress the revolt, but in the conflict that ensued the rebel nobles slew Yāqūt, and imprisoned her. She was placed in charge of Altūniya, and her brother Mu'iz-ud-dīn Bahrām was proclaimed Sultān of Delhi. Raziyya tried to extricate herself from the critical situation by marrying Altūniya, but to no effect. She marched with her husband towards Delhi, but on arriving near Kaithal she was deserted by the followers of Altūniya and defeated on the 13th October, 1240, by Mu'iz-ud-dīn Bahrām. She was put to death with her husband the next day. Thus the life of the queen Raziyya ended miserably after a reign of three years and a few royal months.

Raziyya was possessed of remarkable talents. Ferishta writes that "she read the Koran with correct pronunciation, and in her father's lifetime employed herself in the affairs of the Government". As a queen, she tried to display her virtues more prominently. According to the contemporary Muslim chronicler, Minhāj-us-Sirāj, she "was a great sovereign, sagacious, just, beneficent, the patron of the learned, a dispenser of justice, the cherisher of her subjects, and of warlike talent, and was endowed with all the admirable attributes and qualifications necessary for Kings". She marched in person against her enemies, set aside female garments, discarded the veil, "donned the tunic and assumed the head-dress of a man" and conducted the affairs of her Government with considerable ability in open *darbār*. Thus she endeavoured to "play the king" in all possible ways. But the proud Turkish nobles could not reconcile themselves to the rule of a woman and brought about her downfall in an ignominious manner. The tragic end of Raziyya clearly shows that it is not always very easy to overcome popular prejudice.

The removal of Raziyya was followed by a period of disorder and confusion. Her successors on the throne of Delhi, Mu'iz-ud-dīn Bahrām and 'Alā-ud-dīn Ma'sūd, were worthless and incompetent, and during the six years of their rule the country knew no peace and tranquillity. Foreign invasions added to the woes of Hindustān. In A.D. 1241 the Mongols entered into the heart of the Punjab, and the fair city of Lahore "fell into their merciless grip". In 1245 they advanced up to Uch but were repulsed with great loss. During the closing years of the reign of Ma'sūd Shāh discontent grew in volume and intensity. The Amīrs and Maliks raised to the throne Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd, a younger son of Iltutmish, on 10th June, 1246.

4. Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd

Nāsir-ud-dīn was a man of amiable and pious disposition. He was an expert calligraphist and spent his leisure moments in copying the Quran. He was also a patron of the learned. Minhāj-us-Sirāj, who held a high post under the Sultān and received various costly presents from him, dedicated his *Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī* to his royal patron.

As a ruler, Nāsir-ud-dīn's abilities fell far short of what the prevailing complicated situation demanded. Ghiyās-ud-dīn Balban, his minister, and later on his deputy, was the real power behind the throne. Balban proved himself worthy of the confidence thus reposed in him. He did his best to save the State from the perils of internal rebellions and external invasions. The attacks of the Mongols were repelled, and several expeditions were led into the Doāb and other parts of the kingdom to chastise the rebellious Rājās and Zamindārs. A party of nobles, opposed to Balban, induced the Sultān to exile him in 1253. But his enemies mismanaged the affairs of the State, and he was recalled and restored to supreme authority in A.D. 1255. Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd died on the 18th February, 1266, leaving no male heir behind him. Thus was extinguished the line of Iltutmish. Balban, a man of proved ability, whom the deceased Sultān is said to have designated as his successor, then ascended the throne with the acquiescence of the nobles and the officials.

5. Ghiyās-ud-dīn Balban

Like his predecessors on the throne of Delhi, Balban was descended from the famous Ilbarī tribe of Turkestān. In his early youth, he was taken as a captive to Baghdād by the Mongols, from whom he was purchased by Khwāja Jamāl-ud-dīn of Bussorah, a man of piety and learning. Khwāja Jamāl-ud-dīn brought him to Delhi in A.D. 1232 along with his other slaves, all of whom were purchased by Sultān Iltutmish. Thus Balban belonged to the famous band of Turkish slaves of Iltutmish, known as "The Forty" (*Chāhelgān*). He was originally appointed a *Khasdār* (King's personal attendant) by Iltutmish. But by dint of merit and ability, he rose by degrees to higher positions and ranks, till he became the deputy of Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd and his daughter was married to the Sultān in A.D. 1249.

Balban was confronted with a formidable and difficult task on his accession. During the thirty years following the death of

Iltutmish, the affairs of the State had fallen into confusion through the incompetence of his successors. The treasury of the Delhi Sultānate had become almost empty, and its prestige had sunk low, while the ambition and arrogance of the Turkish nobles had increased. In short, as Barnī writes, "Fear of the governing power, which is the basis of all good government, and the source of the glory and splendour of all States, had departed from the hearts of all men, and the country had fallen into a wretched condition". To add to the evil of internal bankruptcy, the Delhi Sultānate was exposed to the menace of recurring Mongol raids. Thus, a strong dictator was the need of the hour.

An experienced administrator, Balban eagerly applied himself to the task of eradicating the evils from which the State had been suffering for a long time. He justly realised that a strong and efficient army was an essential requisite for the stability of his government. He therefore set himself to the task of reorganising the armed forces. "The cavalry and the infantry, both old and new, were placed under the command" of experienced and faithful officers (*maliks*). He next turned his attention towards restoring order in the Doāb and the neighbourhood of Delhi, which had been exposed, for the last thirty years of weak rule, to the predatory raids of the Rājputs of Mewāt (the district round Ālwar) and different robber bands. Life, property and commerce had become unsafe. The Sultān drove away the Mewātīs from the jungles in the neighbourhood of Delhi, and put many of them to the sword. He also took precautionary steps against any future disturbances by building a fort at Gopālgir and by establishing several posts near the city of Delhi in charge of Afghān officers. In the next year (1267), Balban suppressed the brigands in the Doāb. He personally rode to their strongholds at Kampil, Patiālī and Bhojpur. He built strong forts in those places and also repaired the fort of Jalālī. Thus order and security were restored, and sixty years later Barnī remarked that "the roads have ever since been free from robbers". In the same year he punished the rebels in Katehr (now in Rohilkhand). After a few days he marched into the mountains of Jūd and suppressed the hill tribes there.

In pursuance of his policy of curbing the power of the nobles, Balban tried to regulate the tenure of lands in the Doāb enjoyed by 2,000 *Shamsī* horsemen since the time of Iltutmish on condition of military service. We know from Barnī that most of the original grantees had died or grown infirm by this time, and their descendants had "taken possession of the grants as an inheritance from their fathers, and had caused their names to be recorded in records of

the *Ariz* (Muster-master)", though there was a general tendency on their part to evade service in the field. Balban tried to remove this abuse by a moderate dose of reform. He resumed the old grants but allotted subsistence allowances to the grantees according to their age. This caused discontent among the grantees, who represented their case to the old Fakhr-ud-dīn, *Kotwāl* of Delhi, who persuaded the Sultān by an emotional speech to rescind the orders for the resumption of lands. Thus feelings triumphed over prudence, and an old abuse was allowed to remain as a sort of drain on the resources of the State.

While thus trying to make his government firm and stable within, Balban did not fail to think of protecting the north-west frontier against the invasions of the Mongols. The latter, having established their power in Ghaznī and Transoxiana and captured Baghdād after murdering the Caliph, Al Mu'tasim, advanced into the Punjab and Sind. In the year 1271 the Sultān marched to Lahore and ordered the reconstruction of the fort, which had been destroyed by the Mongols during the preceding reigns. For long the Sultān's cousin, Sher Khān Sunqar, an able servant of the State, who held the fiefs of Bhātinda, Bhatnair, Sāmāna and Sunām, "had been a great barrier to the inroads of the Mongols". But the Sultān was suspicious of him, as he was one of "The Forty" and had avoided coming to Delhi since his accession. He died about this time, and Barnī writes that "the Sultān caused him to be poisoned". If Barnī's statement be true, then Balban's action was not only bad but also impolitic. Sher Khān had defended the frontier with remarkable ability and had also brought under control various defiant tribes. His death now encouraged the Mongols to ravage the frontier tracts. To check their depredations the Sultān appointed his eldest son, Prince Muhammad (popularly known as *Khān-i-Shahīd*, the Martyr Prince), governor of Multān. Prince Muhammad was a man of moderate habits, endowed with courage and ability, and a generous patron of letters. At the same time the Sultān placed his second son, Bughrā Khān, in charge of the territories of Sāmāna and Sunām, instructing him to strengthen his army to check the apprehended incursions of the Mongols. About the year 1279 the marauders actually renewed their raids and even crossed the Sutlej. But they were completely routed by the combined troops of Prince Muhammad coming from Multān, of Bughrā Khān coming from Sāmāna, and of Malik Mubārak Bektars coming from Delhi. Thus the Mongol menace was warded off for the time being.

In the same year another danger threatened Balban from the

rich province of Bengal, the distance of which often tempted its governors to defy the authority of Delhi, especially when it grew weak. This was the rebellion of Tughril Khān, the Sultān's deputy in Bengal. Tughril was an active, courageous and generous Turk and his administration in Bengal was marked with success. But ambition soon gained possession of his mind. The old age of the Delhi Sultān, and the recrudescence of Mongol raids on the north-west frontier, encouraged him to raise the standard of revolt at the instigation of some counsellors.

The rebellion of Tughril Khān greatly perturbed Balban, who at once sent a large army to Bengal under the command of Alptigīn *Mu-i-darāz* (long-haired), entitled Amīr Khān. But Amīr Khān was defeated by the rebel governor and many of his troops were won over by the latter by lavish gifts. The Sultān became so much enraged at the defeat of Amīr Khān that he ordered him to be hanged over the gate of Delhi. Next year (1280) another army was sent to Bengal under Malik Targhī, but this expedition, too, was repulsed by Tughril. Highly exasperated at this turn of affairs, Balban "now devoted all his attention and energy to effect the defeat of Tughril". He decided to march in person to Lakhnautī, the capital of Western Bengal, with a powerful army, accompanied by his son, Bughrā Khān. In the meanwhile, Tughril, on learning of the approach of the infuriated Sultān, had left Lakhnautī and fled into the jungles of Jājnagar. The Sultān advanced into Eastern Bengal in pursuit of the runaway rebel and his comrades, who were accidentally discovered by a follower of Balban named Sher Andāz. Another of his followers, named Malik Muqaddir, soon brought Tughril down with an arrow-shot; his head was cut off and his body was flung into the river. His relatives and most of his troops were captured. On returning to Lakhnautī the Sultān inflicted exemplary punishments on the relatives and adherents of Tughril. Before leaving Bengal he appointed his second son, Bughrā Khān, governor of the province, and instructed him not to indulge in pleasure but to be careful in the work of administration.

Soon a great calamity befell the Sultān. The Mongols invaded the Punjab in A.D. 1285 under their leader Tamar, and the Sultān's eldest son, Prince Muhammad, who had been placed in charge of Multān, proceeded towards Lahore and Dīpālpur. He was killed in an ambush, while fighting with the Mongols, on the 9th March A.D. 1285. This sacrifice of life earned for him the posthumous title of *Shahīd*, "the Martyr". The death of this excellent prince gave a terrible shock to the old Sultān, then eighty years of age

It cast him into a state of deep depression and hastened his death. The Sultān first intended to nominate Bughrā Khān as his successor, But the latter's unwillingness to accept the responsibilities of kingship made him nominate Kai Khusrav, his grandson. Balban breathed his last towards the close of the year A.D. 1287 after a reign of about twenty-two years.

As has already been noted, the Delhi Sultānate was beset with danger and difficulties at the time of Balban's accession, which could not be removed, to borrow Carlyle's phrase, "by mere rose-water surgery". The Sultān, therefore, adopted a policy of sternness and severity to those whom he considered to be the enemies of the State. It must be admitted to his credit that, by his firmness towards ambitious nobles, rebel subjects and unruly tribes, and by his constant vigilance against the Mongols, he saved the Sultānate from impending disintegration and gave it strength and efficiency. But in two cases, that is in doing away with Sher Khān and Amīr Khān, suspicion and anger triumphed over prudence and foresight. Referring to the death of Amīr Khān, Barnī observes that his "condign punishment excited a strong feeling of opposition among the wise men of the day, who looked upon it as a token that the reign of Balban was drawing to an end".

Balban did his best to raise the prestige and majesty of the Delhi Sultānate. After his accession to the throne, he adopted a dignified mode of living. He remodelled his court after the manner of the old Persian kings and introduced Persian etiquette and ceremonial. Under him the Delhi court acquired celebrity for its great magnificence, and it gave shelter to many (not less than fifteen) exiled princes from Central Asia. The famous poet Amīr Khusrav, surnamed the "Parrot of India", was a contemporary of Balban. The Sultān had a lofty sense of kingly dignity. He always appeared in full dress even before his private attendants. He excluded men of humble origin from important posts.

Balban considered the sovereign to be the representative of God upon earth, but he believed that it behoved him to maintain the dignity of his position by performing certain duties faithfully. These were, according to him, to protect religion and fulfil the provisions of the *Shariat*, to check immoral and sinful actions, to appoint pious men to offices and to dispense justice with equality. "All that I can do," he once remarked, "is to crush the cruelties of the cruel and to see that all persons are equal before the law. The glory of the State rests upon a rule which makes its subjects happy and prosperous." He had a strong sense of justice, which he administered without any partiality. To keep himself well


INDIA
Turko-Afghān Period
Kilometres
0 100 200 300 400 500 600 700 800
TIBET
Balkh
PAMIR
Kandahar
Peshawar
Kangra
Lahore
Multan
Delhi
R. Indus
SIND
Ajmere
Ranthambor
Gwalior
Tatta
Cambay
Anhilwara
GUJARAT
Junagarh
Chanderi
Benares
Gaur
BIHAR
R. Damodar
R. Brahmaputra
HIMALAYA MOUNTAINS
OUDH
R. Ganges
MALWA
Dhar
Ujjain
Daulatabad
DEVAGIRI
YADAVAS
Bidar
Warangal
KAKATIYAS
Cuttack
Raichur
Hampi
HOYSALAS
Dvarasamudra
Madura
PANDYAS
Kayal
CHOLAS
Rameswaram
CEYLON
Muslim Conquests
Independent States
Malik Kafur's March

informed about the affairs of the State he appointed spies in the fiefs of the Sultānate.

Balban's career as a Sultān was one of struggle against internal troubles and external danger. He had, therefore, no opportunity to launch aggressive conquests with a view to expanding the limits of his dominions. Though his courtiers urged him to these, he remained content with measures of pacification, consolidation and protection. He did not embark upon any administrative reorganisation embracing the different spheres of life. In fact, he established a dictatorship whose stability depended upon the personal strength of the ruler.

6. End of the so-called Slave Dynasty : Kaiqubād

The truth of the observation was illustrated by the reign of his weak successor, Mu'iz-ud-dīn Kaiqubād, son of Bughrā Khān. This young man of seventeen or eighteen years was placed on the throne by the chief officers of the State in disregard of the deceased Sultān's nomination. During his early days Kaiqubād was brought up under stern discipline by his grandfather. His tutors "watched him so carefully that he never cast his eyes on any fair damsel, and never tasted a cup of wine". But his wisdom and restraint disappeared when he found himself suddenly elevated to the throne. He "plunged himself at once into a whirlpool of pleasure and paid no thought to the duties of his station". The ambitious Nizām-ud-dīn, son-in-law of Fakhr-ud-dīn, the old *Kotwāl* of Delhi, gathered all power into his hands. Under his influence, the old officers of the State were disgraced. Disorder and confusion prevailed through the whole kingdom, and confusion was made worse confounded by the contests of the nobles, representing the Turkish party and the Khaljī party, for supremacy in the State. The Khaljīs, under the leadership of Malik Jalāl-ud-dīn Fīrūz, gained the upper hand and killed Aitamar Kachhan and Aitamar Surkha, the leaders of the Turkish party. Kaiqubād, now a helpless physical wreck, was done to death in his palace of mirrors at Kilokhrī by a Khaljī noble whose father had been executed by his orders. Kaiqubād's body was thrown into the Jumnā. Fīrūz ascended the throne in the palace of Kilokhrī, on the 13th June, 1290, under the title of Jalāl-ud-dīn Fīrūz Shāh, after doing away with Kayūmars, an infant son of the murdered Sultān. Thus the work of Balban was undone and his dynasty came to an end in an ignominious manner.

7. Nature of the Rule of the Ilbarī Turks

The Ilbarī Turks ruled in India for about eight decades (1206–1290), but under them the kingdom of Delhi "was not a homogeneous political entity".[1] The authority of the Sultāns was normally recognised in the territory corresponding to the United Provinces of Āgra and Oudh, Bihār, Gwālior, Sind and certain parts of Central India and Rājputanā. The Bengal Governors were mostly inclined to remain independent of their control, and the imperial hold over the Punjab was occasionally threatened by the Mongols. The fiefs on all sides of Delhi were indeed nuclei of Muslim influence, but there were many independent local chieftains and disaffected inhabitants always inclined to defy the authority of the central government. The Sultāns of the line, whose deeds are recorded above, certainly did not refrain from acts of severity in their attempt to establish strong government in the newly conquered territory. But the estimate of their character by historians like Smith lacks justification. Several kings including Balban were men noted for their strength of character. Though they were bent upon suppressing the defiant chieftains, many of the original inhabitants who submitted to them were employed in military as well as civil offices. "On the whole it may be assumed," remarks Sir Wolseley Haig, "that the rule of the Slave Kings . . . was as just and humane as that of the Norman Kings in England and far more tolerant than that of Philip II in Spain and the Netherlands."

[1] *Cambridge Hist.*, Vol. III, p. 87.

CHAPTER III

THE KHALJĪS AND THE EXPANSION OF THE SULTĀNATE TO THE SOUTH

1. Jalāl-ud-dīn Fīrūz

THE people of Delhi did not at first welcome the new Khaljī ruler, Jalāl-ud-dīn Fīrūz, as they considered him to be of Afghān stock. But the late Major Raverty sought to prove that the Khaljīs could not be classed as Afghāns or Pathāns, and he assigns to them a Turkish origin.[1] The contemporary historian Ziā-ud-dīn Barnī, however, states that Jalāl-ud-dīn "came of a race different from the Turks" and that by the death of Kaiqubād "the Turks lost the Empire". Some modern writers suggest that the Khaljīs were originally of Turkish origin but had acquired Afghān character during their long residence in Afghānistān, and "between them and the Turks there was no love lost". Be that as it may, they took advantage of the political disorders of the time to establish their power.

Jalāl-ud-dīn was at first not much liked by the nobles and the populace of Delhi, and had to make Kilokhrī the seat of his government. However, as Barnī writes, the "excellence of his character, his justice, generosity and devotion, gradually removed the aversion of the people, and hopes of grants of land assisted in conciliating, though grudgingly and unwillingly, the affections of his nobles".

The new Sultān was an old man of seventy when he was elected to the throne. "Preoccupied with preparations for the next world," he proved to be too mild and tender to hold his power in those troublous times. Disposed to rule without bloodshed or oppression, he showed "the most impolitic tenderness towards rebels and other criminals". When, in the second year of his reign, Malik Chhajjū, a nephew of Balban, who held the fief of Kara, rebelled against him with the help of several nobles, he, out of imprudent generosity, pardoned the rebels.

As a natural result of the Sultān's peaceful disposition and leniency, there was a recrudescence of baronial intrigues and tl

[1] *J.A.S.B.*, 1875, Part I, pp. 35–7.

authority of the Delhi throne ceased to be respected. This made him unpopular even with the Khaljī nobles, who aspired after power and privileges during the rule of one of their leaders. One of them, Malik Ahmad Chap, who held the post of Master of Ceremonies, told him plainly "that a King should reign and observe the rules of government, or else be content to relinquish the throne". There was only one unfortunate departure from this generous policy, when, by the Sultān's order, Siddī Maulā, a *darvesh*, was executed on mere suspicion of treason.

Such a ruler could not pursue a vigorous policy of conquest. Thus his expedition against Ranthambhor was a failure. The Sultān turned away from capturing the fort there with the conviction that it could not be accomplished "without sacrificing the lives of many Mussalmāns". But he was more successful against a horde of Mongols, numbering about 150,000 strong, who in A.D. 1292 invaded India under a grandson of Halākū (Hulâgū). Severely defeated by the Sultān's troops the invaders made peace. Their army was permitted to return from India, but Ulghū, a descendant of Chingīz, and many of the rank and file embraced Islam, settled near Delhi and came to be known as "New Mussalmāns". This was an ill-advised concession, which produced trouble in the future. The "New Mussalmāns" proved to be turbulent neighbours of the Delhi Government and caused it much anxiety. Even such a peace-loving king could not die a natural death on his bed. By a strange irony of fate he was done to death by his ambitious nephew in 1296.

2. 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī

'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī, nephew of Jalāl-ud-dīn Fīrūz, was brought up by his uncle with affection and care. Out of excessive fondness for this fatherless nephew, Fīrūz made him also his son-in-law. On being raised to the throne of Delhi, Fīrūz placed him in charge of the fief of Kara in the district of Allahābād. It was here that seeds of ambition were sown in 'Alā-ud-dīn's mind. The "crafty suggestions of the Kara rebels", writes Barnī, "made a lodgement in his brain, and, from the very first year of his occupation of that territory, he began to follow up his design of proceeding to some distant quarter and amassing money". It might be that domestic unhappiness, due to the intrigues of his mother-in-law, Malikā Jahān, and his wife, also made him inclined to establish power and influence independent of the Delhi court. A successful raid into Mālwa in 1292 and the capture of the town of Bhīlsa, for which he was rewarded with the fief of Oudh in addition to that of Kara, whetted his ambition.

At Bhīlsa, 'Alā-ud-dīn heard vague rumours of the fabulous wealth of the kingdom of Devagiri, which extended over the western Deccan and was then ruled by Rāmchandradeva of the Yādava dynasty,[1] and resolved to conquer it. Concealing his intention from his uncle, he marched to the Deccan through Central India and the Vindhyan region at the head of a few thousand cavalry and arrived before Devagiri. Contact of Islam with this part of India had begun much earlier, since the eighth century at the latest. Rāmchandradeva was not prepared for such an attack, and his son, Śaṅkaradeva, had gone southwards with the greater part of his army. He was thus taken by surprise, defeated after a futile resistance, and compelled to make peace with the invader by promising to pay a heavy ransom. But as 'Alā-ud-dīn was about to start marching towards Kara, Sankaradeva hurried back to Devagiri and offered battle with the invaders, in spite of his father's request to the contrary. His enthusiasm brought him initial success, but he was soon defeated and a general panic ensued in his army, which led his followers to run away in different directions in utter confusion. Rāmchandradeva solicited the help of the other rulers of Peninsular India, but to no effect, and he was also greatly handicapped for want of provisions. No way was left for him but to sue for peace, which was concluded on harder terms than before. 'Alā-ud-dīn returned to Kara with enormous booty in gold, silver, silk, pearls and precious stones. This daring raid of the Khaljī invader not only entailed a heavy economic drain on the Deccan, but it also opened the way for the ultimate Muslim domination over the lands beyond the Vindhyas.

'Alā-ud-dīn had no intention of sharing the wealth with the Sultān of Delhi. Rather it widened the range of his ambition with the throne of Delhi as its goal. In spite of the honest counsels of his officers, especially of Ahmad Chap, the most outspoken of all, the old Sultān, Jalāl-ud-dīn Fīrūz, blinded by his affection for his nephew and son-in-law, 'Alā-ud-dīn, allowed himself to be lured into a trap laid by the latter. Urged on by a traitor at his court, he hurried on a boat to meet his favourite nephew at Kara without taking even the necessary precautions for self-defence, and this mistake cost him his life. The adherents of 'Alā-ud-dīn proclaimed him Sultān in his camp on the 19th July, 1296. But 'Alā-ud-dīn, as Barnī writes, "did not escape retribution for the blood of his patron. . . . Fate at length placed a betrayer in his

[1] We have an interesting note about this kingdom in *J.R.A.S.*, Vol. II, p. 398. Eastern Deccan was then ruled by Rudrammā Devī, daughter of Rājā Ganapati of the Kākatīya dynasty.

path (Malik Kāfūr) by whom his family was destroyed . . . and the retribution which fell upon it never had a parallel even in any infidel land".

It was next necessary for 'Alā-ud-dīn to establish himself firmly at Delhi, where the Queen-dowager, Malikā Jahān, had in the meanwhile placed her younger son on the throne under the title of Rukn-ud-dīn Ibrāhīm. Her elder son, Arkalī Khān, dissatisfied with some of her acts, had remained at Multān. 'Alā-ud-dīn, on hearing of this dissension, marched hurriedly for Delhi in the midst of heavy rains. After a feeble resistance Ibrāhīm, deserted by his treacherous followers, left Delhi and fled to Multān with his mother and the faithful Ahmad Chap. 'Alā-ud-dīn won over the nobles, the officers and the populace of Delhi to his cause by a lavish distribution of the Deccan gold. On entering Delhi he was enthroned in the Red Palace of Balban on the 3rd October, 1296. The fugitive relatives and friends of the late Sultān were not allowed to remain in Multān. They were captured by 'Alā-ud-dīn's brother, Ulugh Khān, and his minister, Zafar Khān. Arkalī Khān and Ibrāhīm, with their brother-in-law, Ulghū Khān the Mongol, and Ahmad Chap, were blinded while being carried to Delhi. All the sons of Arkalī were put to death; he and his brother were confined in the fort of Hānsī; and Malikā Jahān and Ahmad Chap were kept under close restraint at Delhi.

'Alā-ud-dīn's position was, however, still precarious. He had to reckon with several hostile forces, like the refractoriness of the Turks, the defiant attitude of the rulers of Rājputāna, Mālwa and Gujarāt, the plots of some nobles, who tried to imitate his example, and the apprehension of the Mongol menace. But quite different from his uncle in temperament and outlook, the new Sultān tried to combat these odds with indomitable energy, and his efforts were crowned with success.

The Mongol raids formed a source of constant anxiety and alarm to the Delhi Government for a long time. Within a few months of 'Alā-ud-dīn's accession, a large horde of the Mongols invaded India, but Zafar Khān repulsed them with great slaughter near Jullundur. The Mongols appeared again in the second year of the Sultān's reign under their leader, Saldi. This time also Zafar Khān vanquished them, and sent their leader with about 2,000 followers as prisoners to Delhi. But in the year 1299 Qutlugh Khwāja marched into India with several thousand Mongols. This time their object was not plunder but conquest, and so they "did not ravage the countries bordering on their march, nor did they attack the forts". They arrived in the vicinity of Delhi with a

view to investing the city, where a great panic consequently prevailed. Zafar Khān, "the Rustam of the age and the hero of the time", charged them vigorously but was killed in the thick of the fighting. His jealous master felt satisfied that "he had been got rid of without disgrace". Probably struck with awe at the valour of Zafar Khān, the Mongols soon retreated. They led another incursion into India, and advanced as far as Amroha in A.D. 1304 under 'Alī Beg and Khwāja Tash, but were beaten back with heavy losses. The last Mongol invasion during this reign took place in 1307–1308, when a chieftain named Iqbālmand led an army across the Indus. But he was defeated and slain. Many of the Mongol commanders were captured and put to death. The Mongols, dispirited by repeated failures in all their invasions and terrified by the harsh measures of the Delhi Sultān, did not appear again in India during his reign, to the great relief of the people of the north-west frontier and Delhi.

Besides chastising the Mongols, the Sultān, like Balban, adopted some defensive measures to guard effectively the north-west frontier of his dominion. He caused old forts to be repaired and new ones to be erected on the route of the Mongols. For better security, garrisons were maintained in the outposts of Sāmāna and Dīpālpur, always ready for war, and the royal army was strengthened. Ghāzī Malik (afterwards Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq), who, as Governor of the Punjab since 1305, was in charge of the frontier defences, ably held the Mongols in check for about a quarter of a century.

The "New Mussalmāns", settled near Delhi, were also severely dealt with by 'Alā-ud-dīn. They were discontented and restless because their aspirations for offices and other gains in their land of domicile had not been fulfilled, and they actually rebelled when 'Alā-ud-dīn's army was returning from the conquest of Gujarāt. The Sultān also dismissed all "New Mussalmāns" from his service. This added to their discontent, and in despair they hatched a conspiracy to assassinate him. But this conspiracy was soon discovered and the Sultān wreaked a terrible vengeance on them by issuing a decree for their wholesale massacre. Thus between twenty and thirty thousand "New Mussalmāns" were mercilessly slaughtered in one single day.

The uniform success of 'Alā-ud-dīn during the early years of his reign turned his head. He began to form "the most impossible schemes" and nourish "the most extravagant desires". He wanted to "establish a new religion and creed" and also aspired to emulate Alexander the Great as a conqueror of the world. In these designs, he sought the advice of Qāzī 'Alā-ul-mulk (uncle of the historian

Ẓiā Barnī), formerly his lieutenant at Kara and then *Kotwāl* of Delhi, who at once pointed out to him the unsoundness of his schemes. As regards the first design, Qāzī 'Alā-ul-Mulk remarked that "the prophetic office has never appertained to kings and never will, so long as the world lasts, though some prophets have discharged the functions of royalty". About the second one, he observed that a large part of Hindustān still remained unsubdued, that the kingdom was exposed to the raids of the Mongols, and that there was no *wazīr* like Aristotle to govern the state in the Sultān's absence. The Sultān was thus brought to his senses. He abandoned his "wild projects", but still described himself on his coins as "the Second Alexander".[1]

The reign of 'Alā-ud-dīn witnessed the rapid expansion of the Muslim dominion over different parts of India. With it begins, as Sir Wolseley Haig remarks, "the imperial period of the Sultānate", which lasted for nearly half a century. In 1297 'Alā-ud-dīn sent a strong army under his brother, Ulugh Khān, and his *wazīr*, Nusrat Khān, to conquer the Hindu kingdom of Gujarāt, which, though occasionally plundered, had remained unsubdued and was then ruled by Rāi Karnadeva II, a Baghela Rājput prince. The invaders overran the whole kingdom and captured Kamalā Devī, the beautiful queen of Karnadeva II, while the Rājā and his daughter, Devalā Devī, took refuge with King Rāmchandradeva of Devagiri. They also plundered the rich ports of Gujarāt and brought away enormous booty and a young eunuch named Kāfūr. They returned to Delhi with profuse wealth, Kamalā Devī, who later on became the favourite wife of 'Alā-ud-dīn, and Kāfūr, who rose to be the most influential noble in the State and its virtual master for some time before and after 'Alā-ud-dīn's death.

Ranthambhor, though reduced by Qutb-ud-dīn and Iltutmish, had been recovered by the Rājputs, and was then held by the brave Rājput chief Hamīr Deva. He had given shelter to some of the discontented "New Mussalmāns", which offended 'Alā-ud-dīn. In A.D. 1299, the Sultān sent an expedition for the reduction of the fortress, under the command of his brother, Ulugh Khān, and Nusrat Khān, who then held the fiefs of Biyāna and Kara respectively. They reduced Jhāīn and encamped before Ranthambhor, but were soon beaten back by the Rājputs. Nusrat Khān was killed by a stone discharged from a catapult (*maghribī*) in the fort while he was superintending the construction of a mound (*pāshib*) and a redoubt (*gargaj*). On hearing of this discomfiture of his troops, 'Alā-ud-dīn marched in person towards Ranthambhor.

[1] Wright, *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum*, Vol. II, p. 8.

While enjoying the chase with only a few attendants at Tilpat, on his way to the fortress, he was attacked and wounded in his defenceless condition by his nephew, Ākat Khān, acting in concert with some "New Mussalmāns". But the traitor was soon captured and put to death with his associates. Other conspiracies to deprive 'Alā-ud-dīn of his throne were also suppressed. He captured the stronghold of Ranthambhor in July, 1301, with considerable difficulty, after one year's siege. Hamīr Deva, and the "New Mussalmāns" who had found shelter with him, were put to death. Amīr Khusrav, who gives an interesting account of the siege of the fortress, writes: "One night the Rāi lit a fire at the top of the hill, and threw his women and family into the flames; and, rushing on the enemy with a few devoted adherents, they sacrificed their lives in despair."[1] Hamīr's minister, Ranmal, who had betrayed his master and gone over to the side of the enemy with several other comrades, was paid back in his own coin for his treachery by being done to death by the order of the Sultān. 'Alā-ud-dīn started for Delhi after placing Ulugh Khān in charge of Ranthambhor, but the latter died five months after the Sultān's departure.

'Alā-ud-dīn also organised an expedition against Mewār, the land of the brave Guhila Rājputs, which, being provided by Nature with sufficient means of defence, had so long defied external invasions. This expedition, as in the case of Ranthambhor, was, in all probability, the outcome of the Sultān's ambitious desire for territorial expansion. If tradition is to be believed, its immediate cause was his infatuation for Rānā Ratan Singh's queen, Padminī, of exquisite beauty. But this fact is not explicitly mentioned in any contemporary chronicle or inscription. The Rānā was carried as a captive to the Sultān's camp, but was rescued by the Rājputs in a chivalrous manner. A small band of Rājputs under their two brave leaders, Gorā and Bādal, resisted the invaders at the outer gate of the fort of Chitor, but they could not long withstand the organised strength of the Delhi army. When further resistance seemed impossible, they preferred death to disgrace, and performed, as Tod describes, "that horrible rite, the *jauhar*, where the females are immolated to preserve them from pollution or captivity. The funeral pyre was lighted within the 'great subterranean retreat', in chambers impervious to the light of day, and the defenders of Chitor beheld

[1] *Ta'rīkh-i-'Alāi*, Elliot, Vol. III, p. 75. The author of the *Hammīr Mahākāvya* gives a different account of Hamīr's death. According to him, the defeat of Hamīr was due to the defection of his two generals, Ratipāla and Krishnapāla. When, on being severely wounded, Hamīr realised that his end was near, he cut off his head with his own sword rather than submit to the invaders. Ishwari Prasad, *Medieval India*, p. 195, footnote.

in procession the queens, their own wives and daughters, to the number of several thousands. The fair Padmini closed the throng. . . . They were conveyed to the cavern, and the opening closed upon them, leaving them to find security from dishonour in the devouring element".

Amīr Khusrav, who accompanied the Sultān's army on the Chitor expedition, writes that the fort of Chitor was captured by 'Alā-ud-dīn on the 26th August, 1303, and that the latter bestowed the government of Chitor on his eldest son, Khizr Khān, and renamed the city Khizrābād before he returned to Delhi. Owing to the pressure of the Rājputs, Khizr Khān had to leave Chitor about the year 1311, and it was then entrusted by the Sultān to Māldeo, the chief of Jālor. But after several years, Chitor was recovered by the Rājputs under Hamīr or his son and became once again the capital of Mewār.

After reducing Chitor to submission, 'Alā-ud-dīn sent an army to Mālwa. Rāi Mahlak Deva of Mālwa and his *pardhān*, Koka, opposed it with a large force but were defeated and slain in November or December, 1305. 'Ain-ul-mulk, the Sultān's confidential chamberlain, was appointed Governor of Mālwa. This was followed by the Muslim conquest of Ujjain, Māndū, Dhār and Chanderī. Thus by the end of the year A.D. 1305, practically the whole of Northern India fell under the sway of Khaljī imperialism, which was then emboldened to embark on its career of expansion in the Deccan.

Although there was an earlier intercourse of the west coast of India with the Muhammadans, chiefly through commerce, the first Muslim conquest of the Deccan was effected by the Khaljīs under 'Alā-ud-dīn. His southern campaigns were the outcome of his political as well as economic motives. It was but natural for an ambitious ruler like him to make attempts for the extension of his influence over the south after the north had been brought under control. The Deccan's wealth was also "too tempting to an enterprising adventurer".

The existing political conditions in India beyond the Vindhyas afforded 'Alā-ud-dīn an opportunity to march there. It was then divided into four well-marked kingdoms. The first was the Yādava kingdom of Devagiri, under its wise and efficient ruler, Rāmchandradeva (1271–1309). The tract known as Telingāna in the east, with its capital at Warangal (in the Nizām's dominions), was under Pratāparudradeva I of the Kākatīya dynasty. The Hoysalas, then under their ruler, Vīra Ballāla III (1292–1342), occupied the country now included in the Mysore State with their capital

at Dorasamudra, modern Halēbīd, famous for its beautiful temples. In the far south was the kingdom of the Pāṇḍyas, stretching over the territory called M'abar by the Muslim writers and including the modern districts of Madurā, Rāmnad and Tinnevelly. It was then ruled by Māravarman Kulasekhara (1268–1311), who greatly contributed to its prosperity by encouraging commerce. There were also some minor rulers like the Telegu-Choḍa chief, Manma-Siddha III, ruling in the Nellore district, the Kalinga-Ganga king, Bhānu-deva, reigning in Orissa, the Kerala king, Ravivarman, ruling from Kollam (Quilon), and the Ālupa chief, Bankideva-Ālupendra, ruling from Mangalore. There was no love lost among the Hindu kingdoms of the south. During 'Alā-ud-dīn's raid on Devagiri in 1294, Rāmchandradeva received no help from any of them. Hoysala kings at times attacked Rāmchandradeva of Devagiri. Internal dissensions among the States of the south invited invasions from the north.

In March, 1307, 'Alā-ud-dīn sent an expedition under Kāfūr, now entitled Malik Nāib (lieutenant) of the kingdom, against Rāmchandradeva of Devagiri, who had withheld the payment of the tribute due on account of the province of Ellichpur, for the last three years, and had given refuge to Rāi Karnadeva II, the fugitive ruler of Gujarāt. Assisted by Khwāja Hājī (deputy *ariz-i-mamālik*), Kāfūr marched through Mālwa, and advanced to Devagiri. He laid waste the whole country, seized much booty and compelled Rāmchandradeva to sue for peace. Rāmchandradeva was sent to 'Alā-ud-dīn at Delhi, where the Sultān treated him kindly and sent him back to his kingdom after six months. Rāmchandradeva continued to rule thenceforth as a vassal of the Delhi Sultānate and regularly remitted revenue to Delhi. Rāi Karna's daughter, Devalā Devī, was captured by the invader and taken by Alp Khān, governor of Gujarāt, to Delhi, where she was married to the Sultān's eldest son, Khizr Khān.

An expedition sent by 'Alā-ud-dīn against Kākatīya Pratāparudradeva in A.D. 1303 had failed. But the humiliation of the Yādavas encouraged him to make a second attempt in 1309 to bring the Kākatīya king under his authority and fleece him of his wealth. The Sultān had no desire to annex the kingdom of Warangal, the administration of which from a great distance would prove to be a difficult task. His real object was to acquire the vast wealth of this kingdom and make Pratāparudradeva acknowledge his authority. This is clear from his instruction to Kāfūr, who commanded the invading army: "If the Rāi consented to surrender his treasure and jewels, elephants and horses,

and also to send treasure and elephants in the following year, Malik Nāib Kāfūr was to accept these terms and not to press the Rāi too hard". On reaching Devagiri, the Delhi army was assisted by the now humble Rāmchandradeva, who also supplied it with an efficient commissariat, as it marched towards Telingāna. Pratāparudradeva tried to resist the invaders by shutting himself up in the strong fort of Warangal. But the fort was besieged with such vigour that, being reduced to extremities, the Kākatīya ruler had to open negotiations for peace in March, 1310. He surrendered to Kāfūr a hundred elephants, seven thousand horses, and large quantities of jewels and coined money and agreed to send tribute annually to Delhi. Kāfūr then returned to Delhi through Devagiri, Dhār and Jhāīn with an immense booty, carried, as Amīr Khusrav writes, "on a thousand camels groaning under the 'weight of treasure'".

After these successes, 'Alā-ud-dīn soon determined to bring under his authority the kingdoms in the far south, renowned for the enormous wealth of their temples. On the 18th November, 1310, a large army under the command of Malik Nāib and Khwāja Hājī marched from Delhi against the kingdom of the Hoysalas, and passing by way of Devagiri reached Dorasamudra. The Hoysala king, Vīra Ballāla III, was taken by surprise in the first attack on his capital. Taking into consideration the overwhelming strength of the invaders, he submitted to them and surrendered all his treasures. The victors further captured thirty-six elephants and plundered a vast quantity of gold, silver, jewels and pearls from the temples. Malik Nāib despatched to Delhi all the captured property and also a Hoysala Prince. The Prince returned to Dorasamudra on the 6th May, 1313, amidst the great rejoicings of the people there. But the Hoysalas became vassals of the Delhi Sultān.

After twelve days' stay in the city of Dorasamudra, Malik Nāib turned his attention towards the country of Ma'bar, extending over nearly the whole of the Coromandel Coast and along the western coast from Quilon to Cape Comorin. The Pāṇḍyas then ruled over this territory. A fratricidal war between Sundara Pāṇḍya, a legitimate son of the Pāṇḍya ruler, Kulasekhara, and Vīra Pāṇḍya, his illegitimate but favourite son, gave an opportunity to Malik Nāib for his meditated invasion of Ma'bar. Sundara Pāṇḍya, enraged at his father's partiality for Vīra Pāṇḍya, who had been nominated as his successor, murdered the king towards the end of May, 1310, and seized the crown for himself. But he was defeated in an engagement with his brother about the month of November of the same year, and thus, hard pressed, sought Muslim help.

Malik Nāib marched to the Deccan at the head of a large army. On the 14th April, 1311, he reached Madura, the capital of the Pāṇḍyas, which he found empty, for, on hearing of his advance, Vīra Pāṇḍya had left the city "with the Rānīs". But he sacked the city and captured an immense booty, which, according to Amīr Khusrav, consisted of five hundred and twelve elephants, five thousand horses and five hundred maunds of jewels of various kinds, such as diamonds, pearls, emeralds and rubies. If Amīr Khusrav is to be believed, Malik Nāib advanced as far as Rāmeswaram. He returned to Delhi on the 18th October, 1311, carrying with him vast booty consisting of 612 elephants, 20,000 horses, 96,000 maunds of gold, and some boxes of jewels and pearls. Thus the "country of Ma'bar came under the control of the imperialists" and remained a dependency of the Delhi Sultānate till the early part of Muhammad Tughluq's reign.[1] In 1312 Sankaradeva, son of Rāmchandradeva, withheld the tribute promised by his father to the Delhi Sultān and tried to regain his independence. At this, Malik Nāib again marched from Delhi, and defeated and killed Sankaradeva. Thus the whole of Southern India had to acknowledge the sway of the Delhi Sultān.

But the raids of Malik Nāib, associated with the sack of cities, the slaughter of the people, and the plunder of temples, "made an immense impression" on the indigenous inhabitants of South India.[2] They had no other course but to submit, for the time being, to the mighty forces of the invader, but they must have harboured a feeling of discontent in their hearts, which ultimately found expression in the rise of Vijayanagar as its political fruit.

In his conception of sovereignty, 'Alā-ud-dīn departed from the ideas of his predecessors. He had the courage to challenge for the first time the pre-eminence of the orthodox church in matters of State, and declare that he could act without the guidance of the *Ulemas* for the political interests of his Government. Thus he spoke to Qāzī Mughīs-ud-dīn of Biyāna, who often visited his court and was an advocate of ecclesiastical supremacy: "To prevent rebellion, in which thousands perish, I issue such orders as I conceive to be for the good of the State, and the benefit of the people. Men are heedless, disrespectful, and disobey my commands; I am then compelled to be severe to bring them into obedience. I do not know whether this is lawful or unlawful; whatever I think to be for the good of the State, or suitable for the

[1] This is known from Ibn Batūtah and some coins. *J.R.A.S.*, 1909, pp. 669–70.

[2] Sewell, *Hist. Ins.*, etc., p. 177.

emergency, that I decree." It would be, however, wrong to surmise from this outlook of 'Alā-ud-dīn that he disregarded the religion of Islam. Outside India, he was known "as a great defender of Islam". In India, there was a difference of opinion on this point. While the supporters of clericalism like Barnī and his followers "emphasise his disregard of religion", Amīr Khusrav, who was a man of culture and a shrewd observer of things, considered him to be a supporter of Islam. 'Alā-ud-dīn himself said to the Qāzī: "Although I have not studied the Science or the Book, I am a Mussalmān of a Mussalmān stock." The inscriptions on 'Alā-ud-dīn's monuments also show that he had not lost faith in Islam.

'Alā-ud-dīn acted according to his conviction, and followed a policy of "thorough", calculated to help the establishment of a strong Government at the centre. The rebellion of Ākat Khān, the revolt of the Sultān's sister's sons, Amīr 'Umar and Mangū Khān, in Badāūn and Oudh, the conspiracy of Hājī Maulā and the plots of the "New Mussalmāns", all of which were effectively suppressed, led him to believe that there were some defects in the administrative system. After consulting his intimate advisers, he attributed these to four causes: (i) Disregard of the affairs of the State by the Sultān, (ii) the use of wine, (iii) intimacy and alliances among the nobles, which enabled them to organise themselves for conspiracies, (iv) abundance of money, "which engenders evil and strife, and brings forth pride and disloyalty".

With a strong determination to stamp out these evils and make himself secure against rebellions, the Sultān framed a code of repressive regulations. He first assailed the institution of private property. All pensions and endowments were appropriated to the State, and all villages held in proprietary right (*milk*), in free gift (*inām*) and benevolent endowments (*waqf*) were confiscated. "The people," writes Baṛnī, "were pressed and amerced, money was exacted from them on every kind of pretence. Many were left without any money, till at length it came to pass that, excepting *maliks* and *amīrs*, officials, Multānis, and bankers, no one possessed even a trifle in cash." Secondly, the Sultān established an efficient body of spies, who were enjoined to report to him everything, even the most trivial matters like the gossip and transactions in the markets. "The system of reporting went to such a length that nobles dared not speak aloud even in the largest places, and if they had anything to say they communicated by signs." Thirdly, the use of spirituous liquor and drugs, and dicing, were strictly prohibited. The Sultān himself showed an example by giving up drinking, and all his wine vessels were broken to pieces. Fourthly,

the Sultān prohibited social gatherings of the nobles, who could not meet without special permission from him. This ordinance was so strictly enforced that "feasting and hospitality fell into total disuse. Through fear of spies, the nobles kept themselves quiet; they gave no parties and had little communication with each other".

Some of the other measures adopted by the Sultān were equally drastic. Large sections of the people had to pay to the State half of their gross produce and heavy pasturage taxes on cattle. The Sultān wanted to reduce them to such a state of misery as to make it impossible for them to bear arms, to ride on horseback, to put on fine clothes or to enjoy any other luxury of life. Indeed, their lot was very hard. None of them "could hold up his head, and in their houses no sign of gold or silver, *tankās* or *jitals*, or any superfluity was to be seen. . . . Driven by destitution, the wives of the *khuts* and *maqaddams* went and served for hire in the houses of the Mussalmāns". For revenue collection, all hereditary assessors and collectors of revenue were made subject to one law, and it was enforced with such great rigour by Sharaf Qāī, the *nāib wazīr* of the Sultān, and his staff, that "men looked upon revenue officers as something worse than fever. Clerkship was a great crime, and no man would give his daughter to a clerk".

'Alā-ud-dīn rightly realised that a strong army was an indispensable requisite for the system of government he had been trying to build up. But its efficient maintenance required a huge expenditure at a time when the influx of wealth from the south had caused a fall in the value of money and augmented the prices of articles. The Sultān fixed the pay of a soldier at 234 *tankās*[1] a year and 78 *tankās* for a man maintaining two horses. He did not want to increase the pay of the soldiers as that would have caused a heavy strain on the resources of the State and of the people, who had already been taxed to the utmost limit of their capacity. But to enable the soldiers to live on a moderate pay, he issued some edicts regulating the prices of all articles from the absolute necessaries of life to things of luxury like slaves, horses, arms, silks and stuffs[2] and adjusting the laws of supply and demand

[1] The value of a *tankā* was a little more than that of a rupee.

[2] The prices of articles were thus fixed:

Wheat	per man	7½	jitals	Sugar	per seer	1½	jitals
Barley	,,	4	,,	Brown sugar	,,	¼	,,
Rice in husk	,,	5	,,	Butter	2½ seers	1	,,
Mash	,,	5	,,	Oil of sesamum	3 ,,	1	,,
Nakhud (pulse)	,,	5	,,	Salt	2½ mans	5	,,
Moth	,,	3	,,				

as well as possible. The land revenue from the *Khālsa* villages around the capital was to be realised in kind, and grain was to be stored in the royal granaries in the city of Delhi, so that in times of scarcity the Sultān could supply the markets with his own grain. No private hoarding of grain was to be tolerated. The markets were controlled by two officers, the *Diwān-i-Riyāsat* and the *Shahana-i-Mandi*, and a body of spies were entrusted with the task of reporting to the Sultān the condition of the markets. The merchants had to get themselves registered in a State *daftar* and to engage themselves to bring all goods for sale to the *Sarāi 'Adl*, an open place inside the Badāūn gate. They had to furnish sufficient securities for their conduct. Severe punishments were provided against the violation of the Sultān's regulations. To prevent the shopkeepers from using short weights, it was ordered that the equivalent of the deficiency would be cut off from their flesh. The regulations worked according to the Sultān's desire so long as he lived, and enabled him to maintain a large standing army at a cheap cost. Barnī remarks that the "unvarying price of grain in the markets was looked upon as one of the wonders of the time". But he does not definitely state the effects of these devices on the economic condition of the country as a whole.

'Alā-ud-dīn reached the apex of his career by the end of the year 1312. But the tragedy of his life was at hand, and he began henceforth to live by the light of a star that had paled. As Barnī puts it: "Success no longer attended him. Fortune proved, as usual, fickle, and destiny drew her poniard to destroy him." His excesses had undermined his health, his intellect became dwarfed and his judgment defective. He became a mere puppet in the hands of his favourite eunuch, Kāfūr, whom he made the commander of his army and *wazīr*, and indiscreetly removed the old and able administrators. Rebellion broke out in several quarters, and palace-intrigues supervened due to the machinations of Kāfūr, who caused the Sultān's wife and son to be alienated from him. The attack of dropsy, from which the Sultān had been suffering for some time, proved fatal. He expired on the 2nd January, A.D. 1316, at the height of his troubles and was buried in a tomb in front of the Jāmi-'Masjid, Delhi. According to some, "the infamous Malik Kāfūr helped his disease to a fatal end".

'Alā-ud-dīn was a self-willed ruler, whose ambition knew no

Thomas, *Chronicles of the Pathan Kings*, etc., p. 160; Elliot, Vol. III. p. 192. A jital (copper coin) was $\frac{1}{4}$ of a silver *tankā* of 175 grains and corresponded in value to $1\frac{1}{4}$ farthing. One Delhi *man* was equal to 28.8 lbs. avoirdupois and 40 seers made a *man*. Thomas, *Chronicles, etc.*, pp. 160–2.

bounds and brooked no restraint, and whose methods were unscrupulous. "He shed more innocent blood," writes Barnī, "than ever Pharaoh was guilty of."[1] The tragic end of Jalāl-ud-dīn Fīrūz, the treatment meted out to the deceased Sultān's relatives, the severe measures against the "New Mussulmāns", not excepting even women and children, are clear proofs of the Sultān's harsh nature. Extremely suspicious and jealous, he was sometimes ungrateful even to those from whom he had received most valuable services. Thus on being established on the throne, he deprived many of those nobles who had helped his cause of their wealth and establishments, threw them into prison, and caused some of them to be blinded and killed. The remarkable bravery of the Sultān's own general Zafar Khān excited his jealousy, and when he was killed by the Mongols, his master was satisfied that he "had been got rid of without disgraee". Barnī writes that 'Alā-ud-dīn had "no acquaintance with learning",[2] but, according to Ferishta, he learnt the art of reading Persian after his accession.

There flourished during the reign of this Sultān eminent scholars and poets like Amīr Khusrav and Hasan. The Sultān was fond of architecture. Several forts were built by his orders, the most important of these being the circular *'Alāī Fort* or *Koshak-i-Siri* the walls of which were made of stone, brick and lime and which had seven gates.[3] "All the mosques," writes Amīr Khusrav, "which lay in ruins were built anew by a profuse scattering of silver." In 1311 'Alā-ud-dīn undertook the extension of the *Qutb Mosque* and the construction of a new *Minār* (tower) in the courtyard of the mosque of twice the size of the old *Qutb Minār*. The building of the new *Minār* could not be completed in his lifetime owing to the troubles during his last days. In 1311 he also caused a large gate to be built for this mosque of red sandstone and marble, with smaller gates on four sides of the large gate.

'Alā-ud-dīn is, however, known to history for his imperialistic activities. He was a brave and able soldier, and the military exploits of his reign were almost uniformly crowned with success. He carried the militaristic ideal of Balban to its logical conclusion. As an administrator also, he showed remarkable vigour in the early part of his reign. To him belongs the credit of governing the State for the first time independent of the authority and

[1] Elliot, Vol. III, p. 156.
[2] Barnī, Elliot, Vol. III, p. 183.
[3] This fort was built in A.D. 1303. Sher Shāh pulled down the fort of Siri and built a new city near Old Dolhi. The site of the fort of Siri is now marked by a village named Shāhbād. *Asār us-Sanādid*, by Sir Syed Ahmad Khān.

guidance of the priestly hierarchy. He was determined to strengthen his government at any cost.

The foundation of the military monarchy that he tried to build up was, however, laid upon sand. His severity enabled him to strengthen it apparently, but it generated a feeling of discontent in the minds of the suppressed baronage and the humiliated chiefs, who naturally remained waiting for opportunities to regain their lost position and power. The great defect of his system was that it could not win for itself the willing support and goodwill of the governed, which is essential for the security of any Government. Its continuance depended on the strong personality of the man who had erected it. As a matter of fact, symptoms of its breakdown appeared during the last days of the Sultān and became fully manifest, to the utter undoing of his work, within a short time after his demise. A just retribution fell upon his family for his ungrateful conduct towards his uncle, and its power and prestige were undermined by one in whom the Sultān had reposed profound confidence—his own favourite, Malik Kāfūr.

3. Undue Influence of Kāfūr

As unscrupulous as his master, Kāfūr now tried to establish his influence as the supreme authority in the State. On the second day after the death of 'Alā-ud-dīn, he produced a will of the deceased Sultān, which, if authentic, had been secured from him through undue pressure, disinheriting Khizr Khān and giving the throne to Shihāb-ud-dīn 'Umar, a child of his master, five or six years old. The minor son was enthroned, Kāfūr being his regent and the virtual dictator of the State. Goaded on by the ambition of seizing the throne, Kāfūr perpetrated most horrible crimes. He caused the elder sons of 'Alā-ud-dīn, Khizr Khān and Shādī Khān, to be blinded, and the queen-mother was deprived of her wealth and imprisoned. He also kept Mubārak, the third son of 'Alā-ud-dīn, in confinement in the *Hazar Sutun* (the palace of a thousand pillars) and intended to deprive him of his eyesight. The youth, however, managed to escape. Kāfūr further sought to remove all the nobles and slaves who were supporters of the Khaljīs. But he was soon paid back in his own coin for his atrocities by being murdered, after a "criminal rule" of thirty-five days, by some attendants of the late Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn. The nobles then brought Mubārak out of his confinement and made him the regent of his minor brother. But after sixty-four days of regency, Mubārak blinded the child in April, 1316, and ascended the throne under the title of Qutb-ud-dīn Mubārak Shāh.

4. Qutb-ud-dīn Mubārak and Fall of the Khaljīs

The early years of the new ruler's reign were marked by success, and he rescinded the harsher edicts of his father. Political prisoners were set free, some of the lands and endowments confiscated by the late Sultān were restored to their original grantees and the compulsory tariff was removed. This no doubt gave satisfaction to the people, but, as Barnī writes, "all fear and awe of royal authority disappeared". Further, the Sultān soon plunged himself into a life of pleasure, which naturally made him indolent to the great prejudice of the interests of the State. His example affected the people also. "During (his reign of) four years and four months," writes Barnī, "the Sultān attended to nothing but drinking, listening to music, pleasure, and scattering gifts." He fell completely under the influence of a low-caste (*Parwārī*) convert from Gujarāt, whom he styled Khusrav Khān and made the chief minister of his kingdom. This favourite shamelessly pandered to the low tastes of his master with the ulterior motive of seizing the throne for himself.

Fortunately for Hindustān, the Mongols made no attempt to invade it, nor was there any serious disturbance in any quarter, during this reign. There broke out only two rebellions, one in Gujarāt and the other in Devagiri (in the Deccan). The Gujarāt revolt was effectively suppressed by 'Ain-ul-Mulk, and the Sultān's father-in-law, who had received from him the title of Zafar Khān, was placed as governor there. The Sultān marched in person at the head of a large army against Devagiri. Harapāla Deva of Devagiri fled away on the Sultān's approach, but he was pursued, captured, and flayed alive. Thus the whole kingdom of the Yādavas fell under the control of the Muslims and the Sultān appointed Malik Yaklakī governor of Devagiri. He also deputed Khusrav Khān to lead an expedition to Telingāna, which was attended with success. After one year's stay at Devagiri, where the Sultān built a great mosque, he marched back to Delhi.

These triumphs made Mubārak worse than before. Many members of the imperial family were killed. Mubārak made a departure from the practice of the preceding Sultāns of Delhi by shaking off the allegiance to the Khalifat and proclaiming himself "the supreme head of the religion of Islam, the Khalifah of the Lord of Heaven and Earth", and assumed the pontifical title of '*al-Wāsiq-billāh*.[1]

[1] *Vide* inscriptions on his coins in *J.A.S.B.*, 1875, 1880, 1886; Thomas, *Chronicles*, etc., pp. 179–81; Wright, *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum*, Vol. II, p. 8 and pp. 43–6.

The regime of this ruler did not, however, last long. Khusrav planned his overthrow, but out of excessive infatuation for him the Sultān did not listen to the warning of his friends. He soon fell a victim to the conspiracy of Khusrav, one of whose *Parwārī* associates stabbed him to death on a night of April, A.D. 1320. Such was the end of the dynasty of the Khaljīs after it had ruled for about thirty years.

5. Usurpation of Khusrav

Khusrav then ascended the throne of Delhi under the title of Nāsir-ud-dīn Khusrav Shāh and distributed honours and rewards among his relatives and tribesmen, who had helped him in the accomplishment of his design. He squandered away the wealth of the State in trying to conciliate those nobles who had been forced to acquiesce in his usurpation. He inaugurated a veritable reign of terror by massacring the friends and personal attendants of the late Sultān and by putting the members of his family to disgrace. According to Barnī, Yahiyā bin Ahmad Sarhindi and Ibn Batūtah, Khusrav favoured the Hindus, and his brief regime of four months and a few days was marked by the ascendancy of the Hindus. Whatever it might have been, the conduct of Khusrav was enough to offend the 'Alāi nobles, who soon found a leader in Ghāzī Malik, the faithful Warden of the Marches. Marching from Dipālpur, Ghāzī Malik, with the support of all the nobles except 'Ain-ul-Mulk, the governor of Multān, who bore a personal grudge against him, defeated Khusrav at Delhi on the 5th September, 1320. Khusrav was beheaded and his followers were either killed or routed. Though master of the situation, Ghāzī Malik did not occupy the throne at once. Rather, he at first made "a decent profession of reluctance". But as no male descendant of 'Alā-ud-dīn was living, the nobles persuaded him to accept the throne in September, 1320, under the title of Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq. It is significant to note that the Muslim nobles, without manifesting any jealousy towards Ghāzī Malik, who had been equal to them in rank, now welcomed him to the throne of Delhi.

CHAPTER IV

THE HOUSE OF TUGHLUQ AND THE BEGINNING OF DISRUPTION

1. Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq

THE dynasty of Ghāzī Malik may be regarded as an indigenous one. His father came to Hindustān in the time of Balban and married a Jāt girl of the Punjab. From a humble position, Ghāzī Malik gradually rose to the highest position in the empire by dint of his merit. We have already noted how ably he guarded the frontiers of the Delhi Empire against Mongol invasions till Providence placed him on the throne at an advanced age.

The choice of Ghāzī Malik as the ruler of Delhi by the nobles was amply justified. The situation on his accession was one of difficulty, as the authority of the Delhi Sultānate had ceased to command obedience in its outlying provinces, and its administrative system had disintegrated during the period of confusion following the death of 'Alā-ud-dīn. But he proved himself equal to the occasion. Unlike his predecessors, he possessed strength of character, largely due to his early training in the school of adversity. A devout and god-fearing man, he had a mild and liberal disposition. He "made his court more austere than it had ever been except probably in the time of Balban". He acted with moderation and wisdom. Amīr Khusrav thus praises him:

> "He never did anything that was not replete with wisdom and sense.
> He might be said to wear a hundred doctors' hoods under his crown."

Soon after his accession, Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq set himself to the task of restoring administrative order by removing the abuses of the preceding regime. The extravagances of Mubārak and Khusrav had brought the finances of the State to a deplorable condition. Ghiyās-ud-dīn therefore ordered a strict enquiry to be made into all claims and *jāgīrs*. Unlawful grants were confiscated to the State. The little unpopularity that he incurred by this measure was soon removed by his wise liberality and beneficent

measures for the welfare of his subjects. He appointed upright governors in the provinces, and considerably lightened the burden of revenue by limiting the dues of the State to one-tenth or one-eleventh of the gross produce and providing against official rapacity and extortion. Agriculture, the main industry of the people in this land, received special encouragement. Canals were excavated to irrigate the fields, gardens were planted and forts were built to provide shelter for husbandmen against brigands. But some of the regulations of the Sultān were not marked by the same spirit of benevolence. We know from Barnī that certain sections of the people were to "be taxed so that they might not be blinded with wealth, and so become discontented and rebellious; nor, on the other hand, be so reduced to poverty and destitution as to be unable to pursue their husbandry".

Reforms were introduced in other branches of administration, like justice and police, so that order and security prevailed in the country. The Sultān devised a system of poor-relief and patronised religious institutions and literary men; Amīr Khusrav, his poet laureate, received from the State a pension of one thousand *tankās* per mensem. The postal system of the country was reorganised to facilitate communications and the military department was made efficient and orderly.

Ghiyās-ud-dīn was not unmindful of asserting the authority of the Sultānate over its different provinces. He pursued the Khaljī policy of military domination and imperialism, a reaction against which began in fact with the failure of his successor, Muhammad bin Tughluq. This is strikingly illustrated by what he did in the Deccan and Bengal.

In the Deccan the Kākatīya ruler Pratāparudradeva II of Warangal, who had increased his power during the period of disorder following the death of 'Alā-ud-dīn, refused to pay the stipulated tribute to the Delhi Government. So Ghiyās-ud-dīn sent, in the second year of his reign, an expedition against Warangal under his eldest son and heir-apparent, Fakhr-ud-dīn Muhammad Jauna Khān. The invaders besieged the mud fort of Warangal, which was, however, defended by the Hindus with strong determination and courage. Owing to intrigues[1] and the outbreak of pestilence

[1] According to Barnī and Yahiyā bin Ahmad, who have been followed by later Muslim writers like Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad, Badāūnī and Ferishta, these intrigues were due to some traitors in the army. But Ibn Batūtah (Vol. III pp. 208–10) writes that the Crown Prince Jauna, who intended to seize the throne, was responsible for these. Thomas (*Chronicles*, etc., p. 108) and Sir Wolseley Haig (*J.R.A.S.*, 1922, pp. 231–7) accept the opinion of Ibn Batūtah, but Dr. Ishwari Prasad (*History of Qaraunah Turks*, pp. 30–2) has pointed out the unsoundness of the latter view.

in the army, Prince Jauna had to return to Delhi without effecting anything. But again, four months after Jauna's return to Delhi, the Sultān sent a second expedition against Warangal under the same prince. The second attempt met with success. After a desperate fight the Kākatīya ruler surrendered, with his family and nobles, to the enemy. Prince Jauna sent him to Delhi and subjugated the whole country of the Kākatīyas, Warangal being renamed as Sultānpur. The Kākatīya kingdom, though not formally annexed by the Delhi Sultān, soon lost its former power and glory.

A civil war in Bengal among the sons of Shams-ud-dīn Fīrūz Shāh, who died in A.D. 1322, led Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq to intervene in the affairs of that province. Among the five sons of Shams-ud-dīn Fīrūz Shāh, Ghiyās-ud-dīn Bahādur, who had ruled independently in Eastern Bengal with Sonārgāon as his capital since 1310, Shihāb-ud-dīn Bughrā Shāh, who had succeeded his father on the throne of Bengal with his capital at Lakhnautī, and Nāsir-ud-dīn, contested for supremacy in Bengal. Ghiyās-ud-dīn Bahādur defeated Shihāb-ud-dīn Bughrā Shāh and seized the throne of Bengal, which was also coveted by Nāsir-ud-dīn, who thereupon appealed to the Delhi Sultān for help. The Sultān availed himself of this opportunity to bring under his effective control the distant province of Bengal, the allegiance of which to the Delhi Sultānate was always loose. He marched towards Lakhnautī in A.D. 1324, captured Ghiyās-ud-dīn Bahādur, who was sent as a prisoner to Delhi, and placed Nāsir-ud-dīn on the throne of Western Bengal as a vassal ruler. Eastern Bengal was also made a province of the Delhi Sultānate. On his way back to Delhi, Ghiyās-ud-dīn reduced to submission the Rājā of Tirhut, which became henceforth a fief of the Delhi Sultānate.

But the days of Ghiyās-ud-dīn were numbered. On returning from Bengal he died in February-March, 1325, from the collapse of a wooden structure which his son, Jauna, had built at Afghānpur, at a distance of five or six miles from Tughluqābād, the fortress-city founded by Ghiyās-ud-dīn near Delhi. He was interred in the tomb which he had built for himself at Tughluqābād. There are two accounts about the Sultān's death. Barnī attributes the collapse of the structure to a crash caused by lightning striking it; and Yayihā bin Ahmad Sarhindi also writes that the structure gave way "by divine preordination". But according to Ibn Batūtah, the death of the Sultān was due to a premeditated conspiracy of his son, who got the pavilion so constructed by the royal architect (*Mir 'Imārd*), Ahmad, son of Ayāz, that it would collapse on being touched by

elephants. Some later writers like Abul Fazl, Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad and Badāūnī suspect such a conspiracy, and most of the modern writers consider the evidence of Ibn Batūtah's statement to be conclusive, as his informant, Shaikh Rukn-ud-dīn, was in the pavilion on the occasion of the Sultān's tragic death. Barnī's account is evidently partial, and his reticence is due to his desire not to displease Fīrūz Tughluq, who had a great regard for Jauna and during whose reign he wrote his work.

2. Muhammad bin Tughluq

Prince Jauna declared himself as the Sultān three days after his father's death in February-March, 1325, under the title of Muhammad bin Tughluq. Forty days later he proceeded to Delhi and ascended the throne without any opposition in the old palace of the Sultāns, amidst a profuse display of pageantry. Like 'Alā-ud-dīn, he lavishly distributed gold and silver coins among the populace and titles among the nobles.

For studying the history of Muhammad bin Tughluq's reign we have besides the admirable history of a contemporary official, Ziā-ud-dīn Barnī, who wrote his work in the time of the Sultān's successor, Fīrūz Shāh, several other Persian works of his near contemporaries like the *Ta'rīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī* by Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afīf, the *Fatūhāt-i-Fīrūz Shāhī*, an autobiographical memoir of Sultān Fīrūz Shāh, the *Munshāt-i-Māhrū* of 'Ain-ul-Mulk Multānī, the *Tughluqnāmah* of Amīr Khusrav, and the *Ta'rīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī* of Yahiyā bin Ahmad Sarhindi, a comparatively late work, which contains much supplementary information. The work of the African traveller, Ibn Batūtah, is also of great importance for the history of this period. He came to India in September, A.D. 1333, and was hospitably received by the Delhi Sultān, who appointed him Chief Qāzī of Delhi, which office he continued to hold till he was sent as the Sultān's ambassador to China in July, A.D. 1342. His account bears on the whole the stamp of impartiality and is remarkable for profuseness of details. The coins of Muhammad bin Tughluq are also of informative value.

Muhammad bin Tughluq is indeed an extraordinary personality, and to determine his place in history is a difficult task. Was he a genius or a lunatic? An idealist or a visionary? A bloodthirsty tyrant or a benevolent king? A heretic or a devout Mussalmān? There is no doubt that he was one of the most learned and accomplished scholars of his time, for which he has been duly praised by Barnī and others. Endowed with a keen intellect, a wonderful

memory and a brilliant capacity of assimilating knowledge, he was proficient in different branches of learning like logic, philosophy, mathematics, astronomy and the physical sciences. A perfect master of composition and style, he was a brilliant calligraphist. He had a vast knowledge of Persian poetry and quoted Persian verses in his letters. The science of medicine was not unknown to him. He was also well skilled in dialectics, and scholars thought twice before opening any discussion with him on a subject in which he was well versed. An experienced general, he won many victories and lost few campaigns.

In his private life the Sultān was free from the prevailing vices of the age, and his habits were simple. Possessed of remarkable humility and generosity, he was lavish in distributing gifts and presents. Ibn Batūtah, who has characterised him "as the most humble of men and one who is most inclined towards doing what is right and just", writes that "the most prominent of his qualities is generosity". Writers like Barnī, Yahiya bin Ahmad Sarhindi, and, on their authority, Badāūnī, Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad, and Ferishta, have wrongly charged the Sultān with irreligiousness and the slaughter of pious and learned men, scribes and soldiers. Ibn Batūtah asserts that "he follows the principles of religion with devoutness and performs the prayers himself and punishes those who neglect them". This is corroborated by two other contemporary writers, Shihāb-ud-dīn Ahmad and Badr-i-Chāch, and even Ferishta has to admit it. Muhammad bin Tughluq's chief offence was that, probably inspired by the example of the Khaljīs, "he ignored the canon law" as expounded by learned Doctors and based his political conduct on his own experience of the world.

But the Sultān lacked practical judgment and common sense, and, rather obsessed with his theoretical knowledge, indulged in lofty theories and visionary projects. His schemes, though sound in theory, and sometimes showing flashes of political insight, proved to be impracticable in actual operation, and ultimately brought disaster on his kingdom. This was due to certain grave defects in his character. Hasty and hot-tempered, he must have his own way and would brook no opposition. The growing sense of the failure of his policy made him charge the people with perversity and enhanced his severity. Foiled in his aims, the Sultān lost the equilibrium of his mind. "Embarrassment followed embarrassment, and confusion became worse confounded." In course of a talk with Barnī, he exclaimed: "I visit them (the people) with chastisement upon the suspicion or presumption of their rebellious and treacherous designs, and I punish the most

trifling act of contumacy with death. This I will do until I die, or until the people act honestly, and give up rebellion and contumacy. I have no such *wazīr* as will make rules to obviate my shedding blood. I punish the people because they have all at once become my enemies and opponents. I have dispensed great wealth among them, but they have not become friendly and loyal."

These measures of the Sultān, as compared with his brighter qualities, have led some later writers to describe him as "a mixture of opposites". But others again have pointed out that he was not really an "amazing compound of contradictions" and that the charges of "blood-thirstiness and madness" were wrongly brought against him by the members of the clerical party, who always thwarted him in his policy. The Sultān's defects might have been exaggerated, but it cannot be denied that he was devoid of the keen insight of a statesman and thus could not adapt his policy to the sentiments of the people. His daring innovations were not welcome, as these entailed great hardships. He was, in short, a poor judge of human nature, who failed to realise that administrative reforms, however beneficial these may be, cannot be easily imposed on the people against their will and that repression generally breeds discontent if the vital interests of the people are affected. Thus, as Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole observes, "with the best intentions, excellent ideas, but no balance or patience, no sense of proportion, Muhammad Tughlak (*sic*) was a transcendent failure".

Like Philip II of Spain, Muhammad bin Tughluq set himself assiduously to looking into the details of administration from the beginning of his reign. He first ordered the compilation of a register of the land revenue on the model of the register already kept, and the revenue department then worked smoothly. But soon he tried an ill-advised financial experiment in the Doāb, the rich and fertile plain between the Ganges and the Jumnā. He enhanced the rate of taxation and revived and created some additional *abwābs* (cesses). It is not possible to determine accurately the actual amount of additional assessment, owing to discrepancies and vagueness in the accounts of contemporary and later Muslim writers.[1] Some modern writers suggest that the enhancement was not "fundamentally excessive" and did not exceed the maximum of 50 per cent that it had reached under

[1] Barnī (*Ta'rīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī*, Biblioth. Ind., p. 473) writes ten or twenty times more, which is wrongly translated by Elliot (Vol. III, pp. 182–3) as 10 or 5 p.c. According to *Ta'rīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī* (p. 103), the increment was twentyfold and to this was added *ghari* (house-tax) and the *charāhi* (pasture tax). Badāūnī (Ranking, Vol. I, p. 305) writes that the taxes were doubled.

'Alā-ud-dīn. They also hold that the Sultān's object in levying extra taxes on the people of the Doāb was not "intended to be both a punitive measure (against the refractory inhabitants of the Doāb) and a means of replenishing the treasury", as Baḍāūnī and, in modern times, Sir Wolseley Haig have suggested, but to "increase his military resources and to organise the administration on an efficient basis". Whatever it might have been, there is no doubt that the measure entailed great miseries on the people of the Doāb, who had already been feeling the burden of heavy taxation since the time of the Khaljīs, especially because it was introduced at a very inopportune moment when a terrible famine visited the land. The State did not relax its demands in view of the famine, but its officers exacted taxes with rigour; and it also took no immediate steps to mitigate the hardships of the toiling peasantry. The Sultān's relief measures, like advancing loans to the agriculturists, sinking wells and "bringing the uncultivated lands under the plough by means of direct state management and financial support", came too late. Agriculture suffered terribly and the impoverished peasantry of the Doāb left their holdings and shifted to other places. In great fury, the Sultān adopted severe reprisals to bring back the reluctant ryots to their work, which produced disastrous consequences for the house of Tughluq.

Muhammad bin Tughluq's decision to transfer the capital in 1327[1] from Delhi to Devagiri, renamed by him Daulatābād, was another ill-calculated step, which ultimately caused immense suffering to the people. This project of the Sultān was not, as some modern writers have suggested, a wild experiment tried with the object of wreaking vengeance on the people of Delhi, but the idea behind it was originally sound. The new capital occupied a central and strategic situation. The kingdom then embraced within its sphere the Doāb, the plains of the Punjab and Lahore with the territories extending from the Indus to the coast of Gujarāt in the north, the whole province of Bengal in the east, the kingdoms of Mālwa, Mahoba, Ujjain and Dhār in the central region, and the Deccan, which had been recently added to it. Such a kingdom demanded close attention from the Sultān. Barnī writes: "This place held a central situation; Delhi, Gujarāt, Lakhnautī, Sātgāon, Sonārgāon, Telang, Ma'bar, Dorasamudra, and Kāmpila were about equidistant from thence, there being but a slight difference in the distances." Further, the new capital was safe from Mongol invasions. which

[1] This date has been established by Dr. Ishwari Prasad (*History of the Qaraunah Turks*, pp. 82–3) on a comparison of contemporary accounts and study of coins.

constantly threatened the old one. The Sultān also did his best to make the new capital a suitable abode for his officers, and the people, by providing it with beautiful buildings, the splendour of which has been described by Ibn Batūtah, 'Abdul Hamīd Lāhorī, the court historian of Shāh Jahān's reign, and the European travellers of the seventeenth century. All facilities were provided for the intending immigrants. A spacious road was constructed for their convenience, shady trees being planted on both sides of it and a regular post being established between Delhi and Daulatābād. Even Barnī writes that the Sultān "was bounteous in his liberality and favours to the emigrants, both on their journey and on their arrival". In all this, the Sultān acted reasonably.

But when the people of Delhi, out of sentiment, demurred at leaving their own homes which were associated with memories of the past, the Sultān's harsh temper got the better of his good sense, and he ordered all the people of Delhi to proceed *en masse* to Daulatābād with their belongings. We need not believe in the unwarranted statement of Ibn Batūtah that a blind man was dragged from Delhi to Daulatābād and that a bed-ridden cripple was projected there by a ballista. Nor should we literally accept the hyperbolic statement of Barnī that "not a cat or a dog was left among the buildings of the city (of Delhi), in its palaces or in its suburbs". Such forms of expression were common among the medieval writers of India. Complete destruction or evacuation of the city is unthinkable. But the sufferings of the people of Delhi were undoubtedly considerable on a long journey of 700 miles. Worn out with fatigue, many of them died on the way, and many who reached Daulatābād followed suit in utter despair and agony like exiles in a strange land. Such were the disastrous results of the Sultān's miscalculated plan. "Daulatābād," remarks Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole aptly, "was a monument of misdirected energy."

The Sultān, having at last recognised the folly and iniquity of his policy, reshifted the court to Delhi and ordered a return march of the people. But very few survived to return, and Delhi had lost its former prosperity and grandeur, which could not be restored until long after, though the Sultān "brought learned men and gentlemen, tradesmen and landowners, into the city (of Delhi) from certain towns in his territory, and made them reside there". Ibn Batūtah found Delhi in A.D. 1334 deserted in some places and bearing the marks of ruin.

Muhammad bin Tughluq tried important monetary experiments. Edward Thomas has described him as "a Prince of Moneyers"

and writes that "one of the earliest acts of his reign was to remodel the coinage, to readjust its divisions to the altered values of the precious metals, and to originate new and more exact representatives of the subordinate circulation". A new gold piece, called the *Dinār* by Ibn Batūtah, weighing 200 grains, was issued by him. He also revived the *Adali*, equivalent in weight to 140 grains of silver, in place of the old gold and silver coins weighing 175 grains. This change was probably due to a "fall in the relative value of gold to silver, the imperial treasury having been replenished by large quantities of the former metal as a result of the campaigns of the Deccan".

But the most daring of his experiments was the issue of a token currency in copper coins between A.D. 1329 and 1330 for which there had been examples before him in China and Persia. Towards the close of the thirteenth century, Kublai Khān, the Mongol Emperor of China, introduced a paper currency in China, and Gai Khātū, the ruler of Persia, tried it in A.D. 1294. Muhammad bin Tughluq also issued a decree proclaiming that in all transactions copper tokens should pass as legal tender like gold and silver coins. The motives of the Sultān behind this measure were to replenish his exhausted exchequer and find increased resources for his plans of conquest and administration. So he cannot be accused of any device or design to defraud the people.

This "carefully organised measure", however, failed, owing chiefly to two causes. Firstly, it was far in advance of the time and the people could not grasp its real significance. Secondly, the Sultān did not make the issue of the copper coins a monopoly of the State, and failed to take proper precautions against forgery. As Thomas writes, "there was no special machinery to mark the difference of the fabric of the Royal Mint and the handiwork of the moderately skilled artisan. Unlike the precautions taken to prevent the imitation of Chinese paper notes, there was positively no check upon the authenticity of the copper tokens, and no limit to the power of production of the masses at large". The result was that large numbers of counterfeit coins obtained circulation. We are told by Barni that "the promulgation of this edict turned the house of every Hindu into a mint, and the Hindus of the various provinces coined krores and lacs of copper coins. With these they paid their tribute, and with these they purchased horses, arms and fine things of all kinds. The *rais*, the village headmen and landowners, grew rich and strong upon these copper coins, but the State was impoverished. . . . In those places where fear of the Sultān's edict prevailed, the gold *tankā* rose to be worth a hundred

of (the copper) *tankās*. Every goldsmith struck copper coins in his own workshop, and the treasury was filled with these copper coins. So low did they fall that they were not valued more than pebbles or potsherds. The old coin, from its great scarcity, rose four-fold and five-fold in value". Trade and industries were in consequence severely affected, and confusion reigned supreme. The Sultān recognised his error and repealed his edict about four years after the introduction of the currency. He paid for every copper coin brought to the treasury at its face value in gold and silver coins, and the public funds were thus sacrificed without any corresponding benefit to the State. So many copper coins were brought to Delhi that heaps of them were accumulated at Tughluqābād, which could be seen a century later in the reign of Mubārak Shāh II.

The Delhi Sultānate was not absolutely free from external danger during this reign. In A.D. 1328–1329 the Chaghātaī chief, Tarmāshīrīn Khān, of Transoxiana invaded India. He ravaged the plains of the Punjab and reached the outskirts of Delhi. The change of the capital from Delhi, and probably the weak defence of the north-west frontier by the Delhi rulers, gave him the opportunity for this ambitious design. According to Yahiyā bin Ahmad and Badāūnī, Muhammad bin Tughluq defeated him and drove him out of the country, while Ferishta writes that the Sultān bought him off by paying large presents in gold and jewels, which he describes "as the price of the kingdom". Be that as it may, "the invasion was no more than a raid, and Tarmāshīrīn disappeared as suddenly as he had come".

Like 'Alā-ud-dīn, Muhammad bin Tughluq cherished extravagant visions of universal conquest. Encouraged by some Khurāsānī nobles, who had come to the Sultān's court, being tempted by his lavish generosity, and had their selfish motives to serve, the latter formed, during the early years of his reign, the ambitious design of conquering Khurāsān and Irāk and mobilised a huge army for this purpose. Barnī writes that 370,000 men were enrolled in the *Diwān-i-'arz* or muster-master's office and were paid by the State for one full year. It is indeed true that Khurāsān was then in a state of disorder under its profligate monarch Abu Saīd, which might be taken advantage of by any external enemy. But its conquest was certainly an impossible task on the part of the Sultān of Delhi, whose authority could hardly be regarded as being established on a secure basis throughout his own kingdom, especially in the Deccan. There were also geographical and transport difficulties of no insignificant nature. To mobilise a large army through the passes of the Hindukush or the Himālayas, and arrange for its

provisions in distant lands, were tasks of gigantic magnitude. It is also worthy of consideration how far it was possible for the Delhi soldiers, who had so long gained successes against the weak and divided Indian powers, to measure their strength successfully with the hardy hordes of Central Asia. Further, Tarmāshīrīn Khān the Chaghātaī chief, and the Sultān of Egypt, both of whom coveted the eastern and western frontiers of the distracted Persian Empire, were insincere allies of the Delhi Sultān, more determined to serve their own interests than help him in his projected invasion. Thus the Delhi Sultān's "scheme was impolitic in the highest degree" from every point of view. It had to be abandoned, probably for lack of money. Barnī writes: "The coveted countries were not acquired . . . and his treasure, which is the true source of political power, was expended."

Muhammad bin Tughluq never entertained the fantastic idea of conquering Tibet and China. But Barnī, a contemporary officer, and Ibn Batūtah clearly refer to his design of "capturing the mountain of Kara-jal . . . which lies between the territories of Hind (India) and those of China". Evidently the expedition was directed against some refractory tribes in the Kumāūn-Garhwāl region with the object of bringing them under the control of the Delhi Sultān. A large army was sent from Delhi in the year A.D. 1337–1338 under the command of an able general.

But after an initial success, the Delhi troops suffered terribly owing to geographical difficulties, setting in of the rains, and lack of provisions. Only a few of them (ten according to Barnī, three according to Ibn Batūtah) survived to relate the story of the tragic fate of the expedition. Its immediate objective was, however, gained, as the hillmen came to terms and agreed to pay tribute to the Delhi Sultān.

But the cumulative effect of all the fantastic projects of Muhammad bin Tughluq proved disastrous for him. They caused immense miseries to the people of his kingdom, who were afflicted at the same time by the ravages of famine, and finally exhausted their patience. Popular discontent found expression in open revolts against the Sultān's authority, and his whole reign was distracted by repeated rebellions, which increased the severity of his temper, undermined his prestige and authority, and accelerated the dismemberment of his vast empire.

The two early rebellions were put down with comparative ease, and the insurgents were given exemplary punishments. Bahā-ud-dīn Gurshāsp, sister's son to Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq and so first cousin to Muhammad bin Tughluq, who held the fief of Sāgar, situated about

ten miles north of Shorāpur in the Deccan, refused to recognise the Sultān's authority and rebelled against him in A.D. 1326 or 1327. But he was captured by the imperialists, and sent to Delhi. He was flayed alive there, his dead body was paraded round the city, and his execution was proclaimed by way of warning to others: "Thus shall all traitors to their king perish." A more serious rebellion, which broke out in the next year, was that of Bahrām Aiba, surnamed Kishlū Khān, who held the fiefs of Uch, Sind and Multān. Muhammad bin Tughluq, who was then at Devagiri, marched to Multān by way of Delhi and inflicted a crushing defeat on the rebel in a fight in the plain of Abuhar.[1] The Sultān was inclined to order a general massacre of the inhabitants of Multān, but was restrained from doing so by the saint Rukn-ud-dīn. Bahrām was captured and beheaded and his head was hung up in the gate of the city of Multān by way of warning to persons of rebellious disposition.

But the suppression of these two rebellions did not in any way strengthen the Sultān's position. Rather, from A.D. 1335, his fortunes began to wane and his authority to be openly defied by Hindu chiefs and Muslim governors of provinces, who were even emboldened to assert their independence. Taking advantage of the Sultān's engagements in Northern India, Jalāl-ud-dīn Ahsan Shāh, governor of Ma'bar, proclaimed himself independent in A.D. 1335[2] and struck coins in his own name. The Sultān marched in person against him, but on reaching Warangal, was forced by an outbreak of cholera in his camp to retreat to Daulatābād. Thus came into existence the independent Muslim kingdom of Madura, which existed till A.D. 1377–1378, when it fell before the rising State of Vijayanagar. This kingdom of Vijayanagar was founded according to tradition in A.D. 1336.

In the north, Fakhr-ud-dīn Mubārak Shāh, governor of the province of Bengal, the loyalty of which to the Delhi Sultānate had been always dubious, soon threw off his allegiance to it in A.D. 1338 and struck coins in his own name. The Sultān of Delhi, then preoccupied with other troubles, could do nothing to subdue him, and Bengal thus became an independent province. Rebellions followed in quick succession also in other parts of the Empire, the most formidable one being that of 'Ain-ul-mulk, the governor of Oudh and Zafarābād, in A.D. 1340–41. All these were indeed

[1] Now a small town situated in Fazalkah *tahsil*, Firozepore district, on the South Punjab Railway. For topographical details *vide* Major Raverty's article on *The Mihrān of Sind and its Tributaries*, in *J.A.S.B.*, 1892, Vol. I.

[2] This date has been established by Dr. E. Hultzsch on numismatic evidence. *Vide* his article on *The Coinage of the Sultāns of Madura*, in *J.R.A.S.*, 1909.

put down by the end of the year A.D. 1342, but they badly affected the resources of the State, exhausted the energy of the Sultān and damped his spirits.

In this extremely embarrassing situation, the Sultān sought pontifical recognition to strengthen his waning authority by obtaining a patent from the 'Abbasid Khalifah of Egypt. The desired patent came and Muhammad bin Tughluq caused his name to be replaced by that of the Khalifah on the *Khutba* and the coins. But his object was not fulfilled. The loyalty and confidence of his people had been too rudely shaken to be restored by the force of the Khalifah's patent. In fact, no one had questioned the Sultān's title to the throne; but it was his policy and measures which were not to the liking of his subjects.

The Sultān was faced with serious difficulties in almost all parts of his kingdom. In Telingāna, Prolaya Nāyaka, and after him his nephew, Kāpaya Nāyaka, organised a Hindu national movement against Muslim rule, with the assistance of the Hoysala king, Vīra Ballāla III. A similar movement was started in the region along the Krishnā. The ultimate result was the establishment of the Hindu Kingdom of Vijayanagar and a few other Hindu principalities in the Deccan. The Sultān's persecution of the "*Centurions*" (*amirān-i-sadah*) aggravated his troubles and "insurrection followed upon insurrection". The foreign Amīrs revolted in Devagiri and the foundation of the Bahmanī kingdom was laid by Abul Muzaffar 'Alā-ud-dīn Bahman Shāh, early in August, 1347. When the Sultān proceeded to quell a disturbance in one part, another broke out in a different quarter. While thus occupied in chasing the rebels in Sind, he was attacked with fever near Tattah and died on 20th March, A.D. 1351. "And so," remarks Badāūnī, "the king was freed from his people and they from their king." In fact, the whole reign of Muhammad bin Tughluq dragged on through baffled aims to a pathetic end, marked by the dismemberment of his vast empire of twenty-three provinces. There can be no doubt that the Sultān himself was largely responsible for this tragedy. Endowed with extraordinary intellect and industry, he lacked the essential qualities of a constructive statesman, and his ill-advised measures and stern policy, enforced in disregard of popular will, sealed the doom of his empire.

3. Fīrūz Shāh, Son of Rajab

The sudden death of Muhammad bin Tughluq near Tattah threw his leaderless army, already embarrassed by the presence of women

and children in the camp, into great confusion and disorder. For two days it was harassed and plundered by the rebels of Sind and the Mongol mercenaries, who had been hired to help the Sultān's army against the rebel Taghī. In this extremity, the nobles urged Fīrūz to ascend the throne and save the dispirited army from destruction. Fīrūz after some hesitation to accept the crown, in which he was probably sincere, submitted to the choice of the nobles. and was proclaimed king, at the age of forty-six, on the 23rd March, 1351. He succeeded in restoring order in the army and set out for Delhi with it. But hardly had he come out of Sind before Khwāja-i-Jahān, the Deputy of the late Sultān, had proclaimed at Delhi a boy as the son and heir of Muhammad bin Tughluq and raised him to the throne. The situation was indeed a critical one for Fīrūz, who, on reaching Multān, held consultations with the nobles and the Muslim jurists. The former refused to admit the existence of any son of Muhammad bin Tughluq and the latter considered Khwāja-i-Jahān's candidate disqualified on the ground of minority. The question was not considered from the legal point of view. It was irrelevant to do so, for in Muslim law sovereignty was not considered to be a matter of "inherited right". As the cause of the boy king was hopeless, Khwāja-i-Jahān soon submitted to Fīrūz, who pardoned him in consideration of his past services and ordered him to go to the fief of Sāmāna to spend his last days there in retirement. But on the way he was beheaded by a follower of Sher Khān, the commandant of Sunām and Sāmāna, at the instigation of his master and other nobles and chiefs of the army. Fīrūz showed weakness in allowing the old officer, of whose innocence he was convinced, to fall a victim to the vengeance of the nobles.

The question as to whether Fīrūz's accession was regular or not is a disputed one. Fīrūz was Muhammad's first cousin, the son of Ghiyās-ud-dīn's younger brother Rajab by his Bhatti wife, who was the daughter of Rānā Mall, the chief of Abuhar. He was trained in the art of government by Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq and Muhammad bin Tughluq, and the latter, according to the contemporary chronicler, Barnī, had left a testament nominating him as his heir-apparent. But the authenticity of this testament has been questioned by Sir Wolseley Haig, who is of opinion that the child whom Khwāja-i-Jahān raised to the throne was not "a supposititious son" of Muhammad bin Tughluq but was an issue of his blood. This view is not shared by some scholars. Whatever it might have been, there is no doubt that the nobles and the jurists selected Fīrūz partly on the ground of necessity. His succession,

according to some, "asserted once more with great force the right of election that had been gradually receding in the background without, however, denying the right of the son to rule. The case also emphasised fitness against merely close relationship to the sovereign".

The task before Fīrūz was indeed a difficult one,—that of raising the Delhi Sultānate from the state of decrepitude and demoralisation into which it had fallen since the closing years of his predecessor's reign. But the new Sultān was ill-fitted for it. He was weak, vacillating and incapable of sustained efforts, and lacked the essential qualities of good generalship. He made no serious attempts to recover the lost provinces of the Empire, and his military enterprises were mostly unsuccessful. In critical moments during his campaigns, he withdrew from them when almost on the point of victory, to avoid shedding the blood of his co-religionists. "His generalship in his two campaigns to Bengal and his eventual reduction of the Thatta, seems," remarks Thomas, "to have been of the lowest order; and the way that he allowed himself to be deluded into the deserts of Cutch, or the defiles of Jājnagar, seems to savour of positive fatuity."

In the east Hājī Iliyās, the independent ruler of Bengal, who had styled himself Shams-ud-dīn Iliyās Shāh, was engaged in extending the frontiers of his kingdom in various directions and "ravaged" those of the Delhi kingdom. Fīrūz thereupon marched from Delhi, at the head of 70,000 horse, in November A.D. 1353 to repel him. On hearing of his advance, Iliyās retreated into the fort of Ikdāla, situated probably at a distance of ten or twelve miles from Pāndua.[1] But he was attacked there by the Delhi troops and defeated. Fīrūz, however, did not reap the full advantage of his hard-earned victory, because without annexing Bengal, which was urged by his commander, Tārtār Khān, he came back to Delhi on 1st September, 1354. There are two different versions regarding the cause of his undignified retreat. According to Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afīf, the official historian of Fīrūz's reign, the Sultān retreated, being moved by the shrieks and wailings of the women in the besieged fort. But some later writers have attributed it to his apprehension of disasters at the commencement of the rainy season. Whatever might have been the cause of his retreat, one has to agree with Thomas' statement that "the invasion only resulted in the confession of weakness".

[1] The exact site of this fort has not yet been definitely fixed. For detailed accounts of it, *vide Calcutta Review*, 1874; *J.A.S.B.*, 1874; and *Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī*, Bib. Ind., p. 591 footnote.

Fīrūz made another attempt to reduce Bengal to submission in the course of a few years. He found a pretext for it when Zafar Khān, son-in-law of Fakhr-ud-dīn Mubārak Shāh of Eastern Bengal, fled from Sonārgāon to his court *via* the sea-route and complained to him of the highhandedness of the Bengal ruler. The death of the brave and able ruler, Shams-ud-dīn Iliyās, encouraged Fīrūz to organise an expedition against Bengal. Brushing aside all previous treaties and assurances of friendship, he marched, at the head of a large army, against Sikandar Shāh, the son and successor of Shams-ud-dīn Iliyās, in A.D. 1359. On his way he halted for six months at Zafarābād on the Gumti and founded in its neighbourhood the city of Jaunpur, in memory of his cousin, Fakhr-ud-dīn Jauna (Muhammad bin Tughluq). At the end of the rainy season, he resumed his march towards Bengal. As he sent no response to the friendly negotiations of Sikandar Shāh, the latter, following his father's example, retreated into the mud fortress of Ikdāla. The Delhi troops besieged this fortress, but its reduction did not prove to be child's play. The Bengal troops bravely defended their stronghold, "until the rains drew near and the floods came to help their cause" against the besiegers. A peace was soon concluded on favourable terms for Sikandar. Thus, the second Bengal expedition of the Delhi Sultān was as abortive as the first one. It merely exhibited once more his weak and vacillating nature.

On his way back to Delhi, the Sultān halted for some time at Jaunpur, and then marched against Jājnagar (modern Orissa). The Rāi of this place fled, on the approach of the Delhi troops, towards Telingāna, and soon tendered his submission by surrendering some elephants and promising to send to Delhi a number of elephants annually as tribute. Fīrūz returned to Delhi, undergoing great difficulties and privations, after an absence of two years and a half.

The reduction of the fortress of Nagarkot, which though conquered by Muhammad bin Tughluq in A.D. 1337 had slipped out of Delhi control during the closing years of the Sultān's reign, engaged the attention of Fīrūz shortly after his return to Delhi. On reaching Nagarkot, he besieged the fortress there for six months, when its Rāi submitted to him. Fīrūz's Nagarkot campaign is interesting because of the fact that he caused 300 volumes of Sanskrit books on various subjects, preserved in the temple of Jwālamukhī, to be rendered into Persian verse under the title of *Dalā'il-i-Fīrūz Shāhī*, by a court-poet named A'azz-ud-dīn Khālid Khānī.

In 1361–62 Fīrūz resumed the task of conquering Sind, which had been abandoned on the death of Muhammad bin Tughluq about eleven

years back. He marched towards Tattah, the capital of the Jāms of Sind, with 90,000 cavalry, many infantry, 480 elephants, and 5,000 boats. The then ruler of Sind, Jām Bābaniya, decided to meet him and formed a battle army with 20,000 cavalry and 400,000 infantry. The Delhi army suffered greatly, owing to the outbreak of famine and an epizootic disease, which carried off about three-quarters of it. Intending to gather fresh reinforcements, the Sultān retreated to Gujarāt. But being misled by some treacherous guides, he drifted away into the Rann of Cutch, and for six months nothing could be discovered regarding the fate of his army. Additional troops being, however, sent from Delhi by his able minister, Khān-i-Jahān Maqbūl, the Sultān again attacked the Sindians in 1363 and forced them to sue for peace. The Sindians agreed to pay an annual tribute of several lacs of *tankās* to the Sultān and acknowledged allegiance to his authority. But his expeditions to Sind, like his Bengal campaigns, revealed his lack of military ability and tactical skill.

There were no Mongol inroads during the reign of Fīrūz. We are told by Yahiyā that the "frontiers of the kingdom were secured by placing them under great armies and the well-wishers of the Emperor".

But no attempt was made by Fīrūz to bring the Deccan under the control of the Delhi Sultānate. When his officers asked him to undertake an expedition to Daulatābād, he, as Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afīf puts it, "looked distressed and his eyes were suffused with tears, and approving their arguments, he said that . . . he was resolved never more to make war upon men of the Muhammadan faith".

Fīrūz was a religious bigot and persecuted the Hindus. He entertained a great regard for the Khalifah of Egypt. For the first time in the history of Muslim India he styled himself as his deputy; during the first six years of his reign he twice received a patent of rulership and robes of honour from him; and on his coins his own name was associated with that of the Khalifah. He tried to conduct the affairs of the State according to the theocratic principles of his faith. He encouraged his subjects, belonging to other persuasions, "to embrace the religion" in which he himself found solace, and framed regulations which deviated from the religious policy that had hitherto been pursued by his predecessors.

Probably with a view to conciliating the nobles and the officials, Fīrūz revived the *jāgīr* system, which had been abolished by 'Alā-ud-dīn, and farmed out the whole kingdom among them besides granting them increased salaries and allowances. Though these

measures apparently strengthened the position of the new Sultān, they ultimately served to engender a tendency to decentralisation, which undermined the authority of the central government.

But with all the above-mentioned defects, Fīrūz has a record of some benevolent measures to his credit, and his long reign of about thirty-seven years was a period of comparative prosperity and happiness for the people. He abolished many vexatious and unjust cesses, which had been levied upon the people during the previous reigns, and devised taxation according to the spirit of the Quranic Law. He allowed the imposition of four kinds of taxes sanctioned by the Quran—the *khārāj* or tenth from cultivated lands, the *zakāt* or alms, the *jizya* or poll-tax on the non-Muslims and other heretics, and the *khams* or one-fifth of the spoil and of the produce of mines. In consultation with the canonists, he also levied an irrigation tax (*sharb*) at the rate of 10 per cent of the produce of the fields. The spoils of war were to be shared by the State and the soldiers, as prescribed by the Quran, the former getting one-fifth of the spoil and the latter four-fifths. The merchants were relieved from the payment of some irregular and oppressive *octroi* duties, which obstructed free circulation of merchandise from one part of the country to another. The State officers were strictly warned against demanding anything more than the prescribed dues, and were punished for unjust exactions. The results of these measures were indeed beneficial for trade and agriculture. Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afīf, though a panegyrist of the Sultān, with whose court he was frequently associated, writes with much truth that, as a result of these regulations, the *ryots* grew rich and were satisfied. "Their homes were replete with grain, property, horses and furniture; everyone had plenty of gold and silver; no woman was without her ornaments and no house without good beds and *divans*. Wealth abounded and comforts were general. The State did not suffer from financial bankruptcy during this reign. The revenues of the Doāb amounted to eighty lacs of *tankās* and those of the territories of Delhi to six crores and eighty-five lacs of *tankās*." Prices of the articles of common consumption also became low.[1]

The construction of a system of irrigation canals contributed greatly towards the improvement of agriculture. Two streams are mentioned by Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afīf to have been excavated under the orders of Fīrūz—one from the Sutlej and the other from the

[1] The prices of articles have been thus stated by Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afīf:

Wheat	1 man	8 jitals	Dal	10 seers	1 jital
Barley	„	4 „	Ghee	1 seer	2½ „
Grain	„	4 „	Sugar	„	3½ „

Jumnā. But Yahiyā, who, as an inhabitant of Sirhind, had a better knowledge of the canal system, writes of four canals being constructed during this reign: (*a*) one from the Sutlej to the Ghaghar, (*b*) a second opened in the vicinity of the Mandavī and Sirmur hills, and joined by seven creeks, was extended as far as Hānsī, and thence to Arasanī, where the foundation of the fort of Hissār Fīrūzā was laid, (*c*) the third flowing from the Ghaghar by the fort of Sirsuti went up to the village of Hirani-Khera, (*d*) and the fourth being excavated from the Jumnā was extended to Fīrūzābād and then passed further beyond it. Fīrūz employed skilled engineers to superintend the canals, and especially to examine and report on them during the rainy season. Another beneficial step on his part was the reclamation of waste lands, the income accruing from which was spent for religious and educational purposes.

Fīrūz's building and gardening activities indirectly benefited the people. He had a great passion for building new cities and renaming old ones. He himself says: "Among the many gifts which God bestowed upon me, His humble servant, was a desire to erect public buildings. So I built many mosques and colleges and monasteries, that the learned and the elders, the devout and the holy, might worship God in these edifices, and aid the kind builder with their prayers." He founded the town of Jaunpur, Fatehābād, Hissār, Fīrūzpur near Badāūn, and Fīrūzābād, at a distance of ten miles from his capital. During his Bengal campaigns, he renamed Ikdāla "*Azadpur*" and Pāndua "*Fīrūzābād*". He constructed or restored a number of mosques, palaces, *sarāis*, reservoirs, hospitals, tombs, baths, monumental pillars and bridges. The chief architect of the State was Malik Ghāzī Sahana, who was helped by 'Abdul Huq. The Sultān's interest in gardening led him to lay out 1,200 new gardens near Delhi and restore thirty old gardens of 'Alā-ud-dīn. He also removed two inscribed monoliths of Aśoka to Delhi—one from a village near Khizrābād on the upper Jumnā and the other from Meerut.

While conforming to the principles of the Quranic law in the administration of justice, Fīrūz tried to make the judicial system more humane than before. We have in his own words: "In the reigns of former kings . . . many varieties of torture were employed. Amputation of hands and feet, ears and noses; tearing out the eyes, pouring molten lead into the throat, crushing the bones of the hands and feet with mallets, burning the body with fire, driving iron nails into the hands, feet, and bosom, cutting the sinews, sawing men asunder; these and many similar tortures were practised. The great and merciful God made me, His servant, hope and seek-

for His mercy by devoting myself to prevent the unlawful killing of Mussalmāns, and the infliction of any kind of torture upon them or upon any men." Some benevolent measures were also adopted by him for the general welfare of the people, who, according to all contemporary writers, held him in great respect. He tried to solve the unemployment problem by starting an employment bureau, and providing employment for as many as possible after a thorough enquiry into each man's merit and capacity. He further established a charity bureau (*Diwān-i-Khairāt*), through which pecuniary help was distributed for the marriage of girls of needy Muslims, chiefly of the middle class, and for the benefit of widows and orphans. He founded a charitable hospital (*Dār-ul-Shafā*), where medicines and diet were supplied by efficient physicians at the cost of the State.

Fīrūz did not issue absolutely new varieties of coins. The coins prevalent during his reign had already been in circulation in the time of Muhammad bin Tughluq. Even the *Shashghani* or six-jital piece, which is especially attributed to him by 'Afīf, has been referred to by Ibn Batūtah. But credit must be conceded to him for having introduced two fractions of mixed copper and silver coinage—half and quarter jitals, described as *adhā* (half) and *bikh* respectively. These mixed pieces facilitated the transactions of the common people and gave the coinage considerable metallic strength. But much of their utility was spoiled by fraud and peculation in the working of the mint.

The army of the State was organised on a feudal basis. The regular soldiers of the army received grants of lands, sufficient for their comfortable living, and the irregulars (*ghairwajh*) were paid direct from the royal treasury. Those who did not get their salaries in either of these ways, were supplied with transferable assignments on the revenue. The last method of payment proved to be a source of great abuse. The assignments were purchased in the capital by some middle-men at one-third of their value, and they sold them to the soldiers in the districts at one-half. Thus a class of people made clandestine gains, without any labour on their part, at the expense of the soldiers. The State army consisted of eighty or ninety thousand cavalry, which could be reinforced by the retainers of the nobles. But it is doubtful if the army was really efficient. Its strength must have been greatly undermined by the Sultān's unwise generosity towards the soldiers. He passed a new regulation to the effect that when a soldier became incapable of service in the field through old age, his son, or son-in-law, or slave, should step into his place. The recognition of this

hereditary claim in military services, irrespective of any consideration of fitness, was undoubtedly a pernicious practice.

The reign of Fīrūz was marked by an unprecedented rise in the number of slaves,[1] for whom the State maintained a separate establishment. The fief-holders in different parts of the kingdom made presents of slaves to the Sultān, for which corresponding deductions were made from the taxes payable by them to the Government. Thus the institution of slavery entailed a heavy loss on the central exchequer.[1]

Though generally opposed to gorgeous display, Fīrūz, like his predecessors, maintained a magnificent and luxurious court, which was, as Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afīf says, especially decorated during the *Id* and *Shabrāt* festivals. There were also thirty-six royal establishments, each having a separate staff of officers to look after its affairs. The expenses for the maintenance of the court and the household establishments of the Sultān must have been considerable.

Fīrūz's minister, Khān-i-Jahān Maqbūl, exercised a potent influence in the affairs of the State. He was originally a Hindu of Telingāna but subsequently embraced Islam and had an official career under Muhammad bin Tughluq before he rose to this eminent position in the reign of Fīrūz. He died in A.D. 1370 and was succeeded in his office and emoluments by his son, Jūna Shāh, who also received his title. On the death of Zafar Khān, the governor of Gujārat, in the next year, his son, Daryā Khān, succeeded him in his office. Later the Sultān received a severe shock from the death of his eldest son, Fath Khān, on the 23rd July, 1374. This gravely affected both his mind and body.

As was the case with most of the Sultāns of Delhi, the last days of Fīrūz were far from peaceful. His judgment failed as he advanced in age, and the efficiency of the government declined. He committed a blunder in trying to share authority with his eldest surviving son, Muhammad Khān, an incompetent youth, who gave himself up to pleasures instead of looking after the administration of the State. A civil war ensued even during the lifetime of the Sultān, and Muhammad Khān fled towards the Sirmūr hills. Fīrūz then conferred the royal title, and the position held by Muhammad Khān, on his grandson, Tughluq Khān, son of the deceased Fath Khān, before he died on the 20th September, 1388.

Contemporary Indian writers are unanimous in admiring the virtues of Fīrūz Shāh. In their opinion, no king, since the time of Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd, had been "so just and kind, so

[1] According to Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afīf the number of slaves in the capital and the provinces rose to 180,000. Elliot, Vol. III, p. 341.

courteous and God-fearing, or such a builder" as Fīrūz was. Fīrūz indeed possessed excellent qualities of heart, such as affection and benevolence; and his reign was marked by peace and prosperity. But his indiscriminate generosity and concessions contributed in no small degree to the dismemberment of the Delhi Sultānate in the long run. His revival of the *jāgīr* system also produced a tendency towards decentralisation to the prejudice of the integrity of the State.

4. The Successors of Fīrūz Shāh, Son of Rajab

The immediate successor of Fīrūz was his grandson, Tughluq Shāh, who assumed the title of Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq Shāh II. He soon fell a victim to a conspiracy of some officers and nobles on the 19th February, A.D. 1389. The nobles at Delhi then acclaimed his cousin, Abu Baqr, as the Sultān. At the same time the partisans of Fīrūz's son, Nāsir-ud-dīn Muhammad, proclaimed him king at Sāmāna on the 24th April, 1389. Abu Baqr was forced to surrender to his rivals, and was deposed, in December, 1390. Largely owing to the strain of his struggle against various difficulties, the health of Nāsir-ud-dīn Muhammad declined and he died in January, 1394. Then came the brief reign of his son, Humāyūn, who died on the 8th March following. The next and the last ruler of the Tughluq dynasty was Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd, the youngest son of Muhammad. His rival, Nusrat Shāh, a son of Fath Khān, the eldest son of Fīrūz, made an attempt to gain the throne at the instigation of some nobles, but it proved futile and he was treacherously put to death.

All the successors of Fīrūz were weaklings and utterly incompetent to save the Delhi Sultānate from disruption, the symptoms of which had already appeared. They were mere puppets in the hands of some unscrupulous nobles, whose selfish intrigues largely fomented the civil wars among the rival claimants to the throne of Delhi. These told heavily upon the prestige and resources of the State, with the result that its authority began to be defied almost everywhere by the Muslim governors and Hindu chiefs. The eunuch Malik Sarvar, who had persuaded Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd to bestow upon him the title of *Malik-ush-Sharq*, or Lord of the East, founded the independent kingdom of Jaunpur; the Khokars revolted in the north; the provinces of Gujarāt, Mālwa, and Khāndesh became independent States; Muslim principalities were established in Biyāna and Kalpi and a Hindu principality in Gwālior; the chief of Mewāt transferred his nominal allegiance from one prince to another at his own sweet will; and the Hindus of the Doāb were almost constantly in revolt.

5. Invasion of Tīmūr

Such was the distracted and chaotic condition of the kingdom of Delhi when Amīr Tīmūr, one of the most terrible military leaders known to history, invaded India. Amīr Tīmūr, son of Amīr Turghay, chief of the Gurkan branch of the Barlās Turks, was born at Kesh in Transoxiana in A.D. 1336. He ascended the throne of Samarqānd in 1369 and then launched on a career of aggressive conquests in Persia, Afghānistān and Mesopotamia. The wealth of India naturally excited the temptation to invade this land, for which the disintegration of the Delhi kingdom afforded him a suitable opportunity. He used his championship of the faith as a pretext to win the support of the nobles and warriors, who were not in favour of his meditated invasion of this distant land.

Early in 1398 Pīr Muhammad, a grandson of Tīmūr, besieged Multān and captured it after six months. Tīmūr left Samarqānd in April, 1398, at the head of a large army, and having crossed the Indus, the Jhelum and the Rāvī in September, appeared before Talamba, situated about seventy miles to the north-east of Multān, on the 13th October of the same year. He sacked Talamba and massacred or enslaved its inhabitants. After capturing several places on his way and massacring many of their inhabitants, he advanced to the outskirts of Delhi by the end of the first week of December, and butchered there about 100,000 adult male captives in cold blood. Sultān Mahmūd and Mallū Iqbāl endeavoured to oppose him there on the 17th December with a large army consisting of 10,000 cavalry, 40,000 infantry and 120 elephants, clad in armour. But they were hopelessly defeated and took to their heels, Mallū fleeing to Baran and Mahmūd to Gujarāt.

On the next day Tīmūr entered the city of Delhi, which was given up to pillage and rapine for several days. Many of the inhabitants of this unfortunate city were either brutally massacred by the ferocious Turki soldiers or made captives, and the artisans among them were sent to Samarqānd to build there the famous Friday Mosque which Tīmūr himself had designed. Thus a tragic fate overtook the capital city of the Sultāns of Delhi.

Tīmūr had no desire to stay in India. After halting at Delhi for fifteen days, he returned through Fīrūzābād (1st January, 1399), stormed Meerut (9th January), on the way and advancing further north defeated two Hindu armies in the neighbourhood of Hardwār in January. Marching along the Siwālik Hills, he captured Kāngra (16th January) and sacked Jammu, the inhabitants of those places being slaughtered in large numbers.

He appointed Khizr Khān Sayyid to the government of Multān, Lahore and Dīpālpūr, and recrossed the Indus on the 19th March, "after inflicting on India more misery than had ever before been inflicted by any conqueror in a single invasion".

Nature also proved cruel to the people of Delhi at this critical time and added to their miseries caused by the ravages of bloody wars and devastations. "At this time," writes Badāūnī, "such a famine and pestilence fell upon Delhi that the city was utterly ruined, and those of the inhabitants who were left died, while for two months not a bird moved a wing in Delhi." Tīmūr, in short, completed the dissolution of the Tughluq kingdom, the vitality of which had already been sapped by internal cankers. Bengal had long been independent; Khwāja Jahān had been ruling over an independent kingdom comprising Kanauj, Oudh, Kara, Dalmau, Sandila, Bahraich, Bihār and Jaunpur; in Gujarāt, Muzaffar Shān owed no allegiance to anybody; in Mālwa, Dilāwar Khān exercised royal authority; the Punjab and Upper Sind were held by Khizr Khān as Tīmūr's viceroy; and Ghālib Khān had established his power in Sāmāna, Shams Khān Auhadi in Bayāna, and Muhammad Khān in Kālpī and Mahoba. To make confusion worse confounded, the decay of political authority in Delhi emboldened the unscrupulous nobles and adventurers to indulge more and more in base intrigues. Some of them helped Nusrat Shāh, who had been so long lurking in the Doāb, to take possession of Delhi in 1399 but he was defeated and expelled from that city by Mallū Iqbāl. On returning to Delhi in 1401, Mallū Iqbāl extended an invitation to Sultān Mahmūd, who had found shelter at Dhār after experiencing many bitter humiliations in Gujarāt, to return to Delhi. He thought that the "prestige of the fugitive Mahmūd Shāh would be useful to him". Sultān Mahmūd returned to Delhi only to remain as a puppet in the hands of Mallū Iqbāl till the latter's death in a fight with Khizr Khān, the governor of Multān, Dīpālpūr and Upper Sind, on the 12th November, 1405. Being a weak king, Mahmūd could not make proper use of his restored position. He died at Kaithal in February, 1413, after a nominal sovereignty of about twenty years, and with him the dynasty founded by Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq came to an ignominious end.

CHAPTER V

DISINTEGRATION OF THE DELHI SULTĀNATE

1. Delhi : The Sayyids and the Lodīs

A. The so-called Sayyids

AFTER the death of Sultān Mahmūd, the nobles of Delhi acknowledged Daulat Khān Lodī, the most powerful of their number, as the ruler of Delhi. But he was destined to hold power only for a few months. In March, A.D. 1414, Khizr Khān, governor of Multān and its dependencies on behalf of Tīmūr, marched against him and took possession of Delhi by the end of May of the same year. Daulat Khān was sent as a prisoner to Hissār Fīrūzā. Some historians represent Khizr Khān as a descendant of the Prophet, and the dynasty founded by him has accordingly been styled the Sayyid Dynasty. But the arguments in favour of this claim seem to be very doubtful, though Khizr's ancestors might have originally hailed from Arabia. Khizr did not assume the insignia of royalty but professed to rule as a viceroy of Tīmūr's fourth son and successor, Shāh Rukh, to whom he is said to have sent tribute. His tenure of power for seven years was not marked by any striking event. The extent of the old Delhi kingdom had then been reduced to a small principality, and the authority of its ruler was limited to a few districts round Delhi. Even in those parts, it was frequently challenged by the Hindu zamindārs of Etāwah, Katehr, Kanauj, Patiālī and Kampila. Khizr Khān and his loyal minister, Tāj-ul-mulk, who was also an intrepid fighter, struggled hard against these chronic disorders till the latter died on the 13th January, 1421, and the former on the 20th May, 1421. Ferishta extols Khizr Khān as "a just, a generous and a benevolent prince", but he was not a strong ruler. Owing to the efforts Khizr Khān made, "there were, of course, the ordinary concessions to expediency . . . submission (by the insurgents) for the moment in the presence of a superior force, insincere professions of allegiance, temporising payments of tribute, or desertion of fields and strongholds easily regained; but there was clearly no material advance in public security or in the supremacy of the Central Government".

Mubārak Shāh, whom his father, Khizr Khān, had nominated as his heir on his death-bed, ascended the throne of Delhi on the very day of the latter's death, with the consent of the Delhi nobles. It was during his reign that Yahiyā bin Ahmad Sarhindi wrote his *Ta'rīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī*, which is a valuable source-book for the history of this period. But his reign is as uneventful and dreary as that of his father. There is nothing of importance to record except some punitive expeditions to suppress disorders, which compelled the Sultān to accompany his armies. He was able to subdue the rebellions at Bhātinda and in the Doāb and recover balances of tribute from a limited area. But the brave Khokars grew more and more powerful and harassed him more than once. Their chief, Jasrat, confidently aspired to the establishment of their supremacy on the ruins of the Delhi kingdom. The Hindu nobles enhanced their influence in the Delhi court itself. On the 19th February, 1434, the Sultān fell victim to a conspiracy, organised by some Muslim as well as Hindu nobles under the leadership of the discontented *wazīr* Sarvar-ul-mulk, when he proceeded to superintend the construction of a newly planned town, called Mubārakābād, on the Jumnā.

The nobles of Delhi then raised Muhammad, a grandson of Khizr Khān and the heir-designate of the late murdered Sultān, to the throne of Delhi. But he also became "the victim of factions and the sport of circumstances". Even when he had the opportunity to display his capacity for rule after the death of the unscrupulous *wazīr* Sarvar-ul-mulk, he abused it in such a manner as to forfeit the confidence of those who had delivered him from the hands of his enemies. Buhlūl Khān Lodī, the governor of Lahore and Sirhind, who had come to help the Sultān when Mahmūd Shāh Khaljī of Mālwa had advanced as far as the capital, soon made an attempt to capture Delhi. Though it failed for the time being, the condition of the Sayyids gradually passed from bad to worse. As Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad writes, "the affairs of the State grew day by day more and more confused, and it so happened that there were nobles at twenty *krohs* from Delhi, who threw off their allegiance (to the tottering Empire) and engaged themselves in preparations for resistance to it". After the death of Muhammad Shāh in A.D. 1445,[1] the nobles declared his son to be the ruler of the shattered kingdom, which now consisted only of the city of Delhi and the neighbouring villages, under the title of 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Ālam Shāh. The new ruler was more feeble and inefficient than his father. He made over the throne of Delhi to Buhlūl Lodī in

[1] There are differences of opinion regarding this date.

1451 and retired in an inglorious manner to his favourite place, Badāūn, where he spent the rest of his life, absorbed in pleasure, probably without any regret for his surrender of the throne, till his death.

B. The Lodīs

Buhlūl Khān belonged to the Lodī tribe of Afghāns. He was a nephew of Sultān Shāh Lodī, who had been appointed governor of Sirhind with the title of Islām Khān after the death of Mallū Iqbāl. On the death of his uncle, Buhlūl became the governor of Lahore and Sirhind. When 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Ālam Shāh voluntarily abdicated the throne of Delhi, he seized it on the 19th April, 1451, with the support of the minister Hamīd Khān. Thus, for the first time in the history of India, an Afghān ruler was seated on the throne of Delhi.

Buhlūl was called upon to rule over a mere fragment of the Delhi kingdom, which again was then in a highly distracted condition. But he was made of a different stuff from that of his immediate predecessors. Born of a fighting clan, he was active, warlike, and ambitious, and was determined to restore the strength of the Sultānate. He got rid of the influence of the old minister Hamīd Khān by cleverly throwing him into prison with the help of his Afghān followers. He also frustrated an attempt on the part of Mahmūd Shāh Sharqī of Jaunpur to get possession of Delhi, and reduced to submission some provincial fief-holders and chieftains, who had enjoyed independence for several years. Thus Ahmad Khān of Mewāt, Dariyā Khān of Sambhal, 'Isā Khān of Koīl, Mubārak Khān of Suket, Rājā Pratāp Singh of Mainpurī and Bhongāon, Qutb Khān of Rewarī, and the chiefs of Etāwah, Chandwār and other districts of the Doāb, were compelled to acknowledge the authority of the Sultān, who, however, treated them with leniency so that they might be reconciled to his rule. His more significant achievement was the successful war against the neighbouring kingdom of Jaunpur, the independence of which was extinguished. He appointed his eldest surviving son, Bārbak Shāh, viceroy of Jaunpur in 1486. While returning from Gwālior after chastising its Rājā, Kirat Singh, the Sultān fell ill; and in the midst of intrigues for succession to the throne among the partisans of his sons, Bārbak Shāh and Nizām Shāh, and grandson, A'zam-i-Humāyūn, he breathed his last by the middle of July, 1489, near the town of Jalālī.

As a ruler, Buhlūl was incomparably superior to those who had preceded him on the throne of Delhi since the time of Fīrūz of the house of Tughluq. Possessed of courage, energy and tact, he

restored the prestige of the Muslim power in Hindustān and infused some vigour into the government of his kingdom. Averse to display of royal splendour, he was kind to the poor, and though not a learned man himself, was a patron of scholars. He enjoyed the love and confidence of his near relatives and fellow tribesmen, who were allowed to share with him his power and prosperity.

After Buhlūl's death, his second son, Nizām Khān, was proclaimed king at Jalālī, under the title of Sultān Sikandar Shāh, on the 17th July, 1489. His succession was disputed, as some of the nobles suggested the name of Bārbak Shāh; but their proposal came to nothing as Bārbak was then at a distant place. Endowed with considerable energy and vigour, Sikandar amply justified the choice of the minority among the nobles. He made earnest efforts to increase the strength of the kingdom by removing the disorders and confusion into which it had been thrown during the preceding reigns, due largely to the refractoriness of the provincial governors, chieftains, and zamindārs. He took care also to check the accounts of the leading Afghān *jāgīrdārs*, much against their will. Marching to Tirhut and Bihār, he asserted his authority as far as the confines of Bengal; appointed Dariyā Khān to the government of Bihār; compelled the Rājā of Tirhut to pay him tribute; and concluded a treaty with 'Alā-ud-dīn Husain Shāh of Bengal, by which both agreed not to encroach on each other's dominion. The chiefs of Dholpur, Chanderī, and some other places, also tendered submission to him. With the object of controlling the chiefs of Etāwah, Biyāna, Koīl, Gwālior and Dholpur in an effective manner, he founded a new town in 1504 on the site where the modern city of Āgra stands. Striving till his last days to enforce obedience from the hostile chiefs, the Sultān breathed his last at Āgra on the 21st November, A.D. 1517.

Sikandar was undoubtedly the ablest of the three rulers of his dynasty. He has been highly praised by contemporary as well as some later writers for his excellent qualities of head and heart. A firm, vigilant, and upright ruler, he entertained kind feelings in his heart for the poor and the needy, patronised learned men, and himself wrote some Persian verses. He dispensed justice with strict impartiality and personally heard the complaints of even the poorest of his subjects. The efficiency of his government chiefly contributed to the prevalence of peace and prosperity in his kingdom, and the prices of the articles of prime necessity became excessively low. He was, however, not free from religious intolerance, which led him to commit some impolitic acts.

After the death of Sikandar, his eldest son, Ibrāhīm, was elevated

to the throne at Āgra on the 21st November, 1517. A faction of the nobility advocated a partition of the kingdom and set up Ibrāhīm's younger brother, Jalāl Khān, on the throne of Jaunpur. But Ibrāhīm frustrated their attempt, whereupon Jalāl fled from Jaunpur but was captured on the way and assassinated by the Sultān's orders. The new Sultān possessed military skill, but lacked good sense and moderation, and this ultimately brought about his ruin. With a view to securing strength and efficiency, he unwisely embarked upon a policy of repression towards the powerful nobles of the Lohānī, Formulī and Lodī tribes, who constituted the official class of the State. By his stern measures he alienated the sympathies of the Afghān nobility and drove them to disloyalty, which manifested itself in absolute defiance of his authority. This embittered the Sultān more and more and increased the severity of his measures towards the nobles. But the latter lost their patience; and soon those of Bihār declared their independence under Dariyā Khān Lohānī. The discontent of the nobles was brought to a head by Ibrāhīm's unsympathetic treatment of Dilwār Khān, son of Daulat Khān Lodī, the semi-independent governor of Lahore. Daulat Khān Lodī and 'Ālam Khān, an uncle of Sultān Ibrāhīm and a pretender to the throne of Delhi, invited Bābur, the Tīmūrid ruler of Kābul, to invade India. Thus revenge and ambition, persecutions and disaffection, brought about the final collapse of the decadent Delhi Sultānate and paved the way for the establishment of a new Turkish rule in India.

Indeed, the fall of the Delhi Sultānate was inevitable under the conditions which had their birth in the last days of Muhammad bin Tughluq. The indiscretions of that Sultān brought on a process of disintegration, which was accelerated by the weakness and impolitic measures of his immediate successor, Fīrūz Shāh, such as the revival of the *jāgīr* system, the extension of the institution of slavery, the imposition of *jizya* on the non-Muslims and persecution of the heretical Muslim sects. This process could not be checked by the weak Sayyids and unstatesmanlike Lodīs. In spite of some military successes to their credit, the Lodīs failed to introduce any wholesome and strong element in the administrative structure, and committed a fatal blunder by making an attempt to suppress the military and official nobility by a policy of repression. An external calamity, which might very well be regarded as a symptom of the growing decline of the Delhi Sultānate, hastened its end. While internal dissensions had been eating into its vitality, the invasion of Tīmūr destroyed its coherence and increased the selfish intrigues of the nobility, who, like the feudal baronage of later

medieval Europe, plunged the whole kingdom into disorder and confusion which it was beyond the capacity of the weak rulers of Delhi to remove by prudent measures. Further, the Tughluqs, and their successors, did nothing to introduce such reforms as could lead to the growth of a unified State in a country like India, where, during the Middle Ages, the sense of social solidarity or of territorial and political unity had hardly grown. Thus the military autarchy of the Turks and the Afghāns could enforce obedience among the governors and peoples of the different provinces only so long as it could retain its vigour. As soon as the central authority grew weak, the centrifugal tendencies, so common in the history of India, made headway, and a number of independent kingdoms arose on the ruins of the Delhi Sultānate. Their history may now be studied in brief.

2. Bengal

The control of the Delhi Sultāns over Bengal was always dubious, and it was one of the earliest provinces to assert its independence. Its distance from Delhi, and its profuse wealth, often tempted its governors to rebel against the central authority, which, as has already been noted, caused much trouble to Iltutmish and Balban. Under the descendants of Balban it was virtually independent of the Delhi Government, whose control was again asserted only in the time of Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq, who defeated Ghiyās-ud-dīn Bahādur Shāh and divided the province into three independent administrative divisions with their capitals at Lakhnautī, Sātgāon, and Sonārgāon respectively. Soon after his accession, Muhammad bin Tughluq appointed Qadr Khān to the government of Lakhnautī, 'Izz-ud-dīn A'zam-ul-mulk to that of Sātgāon, and restored Ghiyās-ud-dīn Bahādur Shāh to the government of Sonārgāon but associated with him his own foster-brother, Tārtār Khān, better known as Bahrām Khān. This partition of Bengal did not, however, serve to remove the chronic troubles in that province. Ghiyās-ud-dīn Bahādur soon revolted and issued coins from the mints at Sonārgāon and Ghiyāspur. But he was soon defeated and killed, and Bahrām Khān became the sole governor of Sonārgāon, Sātgāon and temporarily of Lakhnautī.[1] Bahrām Khān died in A.D. 1336, whereupon his armour-bearer, Fakhr-ud-dīn, immediately proclaimed himself ruler of Sonārgāon under the title of Fakhr-ud-

[1] One author, Shihabuddin Talis, who was an officer of Aurangzeb, refers to the conquest of Chittagong by Fakhr-ud-dīn Mubārak Shāh. Sarkar, *Studies in Mughal India*, p. 122. But as this statement is not corroborated by any other contemporary evidence, it is difficult to vouchsafe its accuracy.

dīn Mubārak Shāh. Shortly 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Ālī Shāh (A.D. 1339–1345) made himself independent in Northern Bengal, and removed his capital from Lakhnautī to Pāndua. The coins of Fakhr-ud-dīn were of excellent quality. These have been described as "veritable gems of the art of coin-striking and speak volumes in favour of the skill of the Sonārgāon artists. Their shape is regular, the lettering on them delightfully neat and well-shaped, and they carry about them a refreshing air of refinement."[1] It has been asserted on the evidence of some coins that Fakhr-ud-dīn Mubārak Shāh died a natural death after an unbroken reign of ten years[2] and was succeeded on the throne of Sonārgāon by Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn Ghāzī Shāh, who was most probably his son.

Ultimately Hājī Iliyās, foster-brother of 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Ālī Shāh, made himself the independent ruler of the entire province of Bengal, about A.D. 1345, under the title of Shams-ud-dīn Iliyās Shāh. Soon after his accession he extended his power in different directions. He even invaded Nepal in A.D. 1350 and destroyed many cities there. It appears that after annexing the eastern kingdom of Sonārgāon in A.D. 1352 he exacted tribute from the kingdoms of Orissa and Tirhut and went as far as Benares. He also annexed some parts of Kāmrup to his kingdom. Thus his activities proved to be a menace to the Delhi kingdom on its eastern frontier, and it was during his reign that Fīrūz of the house of Tughluq made an attempt to recover the lost province of Bengal, which, however, ended in failure. Iliyās died at Pāndua in A.D. 1357. His reign was marked by peace and prosperity, which "are attested by the inauguration of a national and typical coinage, and by the growth of a taste for the arts of peace, especially architecture".

Iliyās was succeeded by his son, Sikandar Shāh, early in whose reign the Delhi Sultān made a second attempt to recover Bengal but had to return disappointed. After a prosperous reign of about thirty-three years, Sikandar died, most probably in October, 1390, in the course of a fight with his son, Ghiyās-ud-dīn A'zam, at Goālpārā near Pāndua. That his reign was prosperous is well attested by his building of the magnificent mosque at Ādīna and by the large number, variety, and richness of the designs of his coins. He had great regard for Muslim saints. The next ruler,

[1] N. K. Bhattashali, p. 11.

[2] Bhattasali, *Independent Sultans of Bengal*, p. 17. The Muslim chroniclers give different accounts about Fakhr-ud-dīn's death. The author of *Riyāz* writes that he was killed by 'Alā-ud-dīn 'Ālī Shāh; Badāūnī states that Muhammad bin Tughluq went to Sonārgāon, took Fakhr-ud-dīn to Delhi and killed him; and Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afīf notes that Fakhr-ud-dīn was killed by Hājī Iliyās.

Ghiyās-ud-dīn A'zam, was a correspondent of the famous poet Hāfiz. He was an accomplished and able prince, having a profound regard for law and Muslim saints. He sent embassies with some presents to Emperor Yung-lo of the Ming dynasty of China in 1405, 1408 and 1409. The Emperor of China also sent, in return, embassies and presents to him. Ghiyās-ud-dīn A'zam Shāh died in A.D. 1410–11 after a reign of about twenty years and was succeeded by his son, Saif-ud-dīn Hamza Shāh. But about this time taking advantage of the growing weakness of the Iliyās Shāhi rule, as a result of some unsuccessful military campaigns, Rājā Ganesh (misread as 'Kans' in Persian manuscripts),[1] a Hindu Zamindar of Bhaturia in North Bengal and an influential officer of the Iliyās Shāhi rulers of Bengal, rose to power and made himself a virtual dictator during the reigns of the puppet rulers like Saif-ud-dīn Hamza Shāh, who ruled for about two to three years, Shihab-ud-dīn Bayazid Shāh, adopted son or slave of Saif-ud-dīn Hamza Shāh, whose rule also lasted from A.D. 1412–13 to A.D. 1414–15, and the latter's son and successor, Ala-ud-din Firuz Shāh nominally ruled for a few months only, and when he died Rājā Ganesh seized the throne of Bengal for himself (beginning of A.D. 1415). This usurpation of authority and restoration of Hindu rule by Ganesh were not liked by a section of the Muslims in Bengal. They opposed him along with the local Muslim theologians under the leadership of Nur Kutab Alam, who wrote a highly exciting letter to Ibrāhim Sharqī, ruler of Jaunpur, inviting him to invade Bengal for extirpating the authority of Ganesh. On his way to Bengal, Ibrāhim Sharqī proceeded through Mithilā, where Shiva Sinha had made himself an independent ruler by shaking off his allegiance to Jaunpur and by removing his father, Devi Sinha, from the throne. Shiva Sinha, also a friend and ally of Ganesh, offered resistance to the Jaunpur army but was overpowered by its superior numerical strength and his father was restored as ruler of Mithila on acknowledging the overlordship of the Sultān of Jaunpur. In Bengal, Rājā Ganesh could not long stand against the vast Jaunpur army and he had to relinquish his throne. Out of lust for the throne his son, Jadusen, embraced Islam and Ibrāhim Sharqī made him the Sultan of Bengal under the title of Jalal-ud-din probably towards the end of A.D. 1415. But soon after the return of Ibrāhim Sharqī from Bengal, Rājā Ganesh recovered his authority as ruler of Bengal and assumed the title Danujamardana Deva ('devoted to the feet of the Goddess Chandi'). Rājā Ganesh now ruled over an extensive kingdom

[1] Some believe that Ganesh was a Barendra Brahmin bearing title of Bhaduri. But there is no historical evidence to support this view.

covering practically the whole of Bengal with unassailable authority till the middle of the year 1418. Ganesh sought to reconvert his son into Hinduism through a purificatory process. But this *suddhi* does not seem to have been accepted by the Hindu society and Jadusen had to spend his days almost as an outcaste during the rest of his father's reign.

Ganesh was a wise and able ruler. Beveridge remarked, "Rājā Kans is the most interesting figure among the kings of Bengal. We feel that this obscure Hindu who rose to supreme power in Bengal, and who for a time broke the bonds of Islam, must have been a man of vigour and capacity." Writers like Ferishta and some others have also praised his qualities as a ruler. He governed his kingdom "in the best manner" and his treatment of the Muslim subjects in general was cordial, though he tried "to reduce the overgrown and unruly Muslim monastic orders to obedience".[1]

Ganesh died peacefully in A.D. 1418 and in the same year coins with Bengali letters were issued from Pandua and Chittagong by a king named "Mahendra Deva, devoted to the feet of the Goddess Chandi". He was probably the younger son of Ganesh, whom some of his partisans raised to the throne for a few months only before Jadusen, by re-embracing the Islamic faith, ascended the throne the same year with the title of Jalal-ud-dīn Muhammad. During his reign Ibrāhim Sharqī of Jaunpur invaded Bengal for the second time in A.D. 1420.

The rule of the dynasty of Ganesh did not last long. Jalāl-ud-dīn Muhammad died in A.D. 1431 and was succeeded by his son Shams-ud-dīn Ahmad, who reigned probably until A.D. 1435–36. The tyranny of this monarch made him extremely unpopular, and he fell a prey to a conspiracy organised against him by two officers of his government, Shādī Khān and Nāsir Khān. Nāsir Khān and Shādī Khān soon became jealous of each other, as both of them aspired to the throne of Bengal, and the former put his rival to death. But he was destined to exercise sovereignty only for a few days, as the nobles, who had been attached to Shams-ud-dīn Ahmad, soon opposed his authority and slew him. They then placed Nāsir-ud-dīn, a grandson of Hāji Iliyās, on the throne, who assumed the title of Nāsir-ud-dīn 'Abul Muzaffar Mahmūd Shāh, as appears on his coins. Thus was restored the rule of the Iliyās Shāhī dynasty.

As is proved by some coins, Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd reigned for many years as a just and liberal ruler. He is credited with the construction of some buildings at Gaur and a mosque at Sātgāon. On his death in A.D. 1459, his son, Rukn-ud-dīn Bārbak Shāh, ascended the

[1] *History of Bengal* (*Dacca University publication*), Vol. II, p. 127.

throne of Bengal. According to Ferishta he was the first ruler in Hindustān to maintain a large number of Abyssinian slaves, some of whom were raised to high positions. Some historians have praised him as "a sagacious and law-abiding sovereign in whose kingdom the soldiers and citizens alike enjoyed contentment and security". He died in A.D. 1474, and was succeeded by his son, Shams-ud-dīn Yūsuf Shāh, who is described in his inscriptions as Shams-ud-dīn Abul Muzaffar Yūsuf Shāh. He was a virtuous, learned and pious ruler and reigned till 1481. After his death, the nobles raised his son, Sikandar II, to the throne. But the new ruler, being found to be of defective intellect, was deposed almost immediately in favour of Jalāl-ud-dīn Fath Shāh, a son of Nāsir-ud-din Mahmūd. He has been described as an intelligent and liberal ruler "who maintained the usages of the past and in whose time the people enjoyed happiness and comfort". Fath Shāh was prudent enough to realise the danger that lay in the growing influence of the Abyssinians, but his attempt to check it cost him his life. The discontented Abyssinians formed a conspiracy against him under the leadership of a eunuch, who had him murdered in A.D. 1486 and usurped the throne of Bengal under the title of Bārbak Shāh, Sultān Shāhzāda.[1] But Bārbak was murdered in the course of a few months by Indīl Khān, who, though an Abyssinian, was loyal to Fath Shāh and was a military commander of proved ability. Pressed by the widow of Fath Shāh, and the courtiers of Gaur, Indīl Khān, after displaying some decent reluctance, ascended the throne of Bengal under the title of Saif-ud-dīn Fīrūz. If the author of the *Riyāz* is to be relied on, the confidence reposed in him as an able administrator and commander was justified by his measures, but he was indiscriminately charitable. He died in A.D. 1489, when the nobles placed on the throne a son of Saīf-ud-dīn Firūz Shāh, under the title of Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh II. But this ruler was done away with in A.D. 1490 by an ambitious Abyssinian, known as Sīdī Badr, who seized the throne under the title of Shams-ud-dīn Abu Nasar Muzaffar Shāh. This Abyssinian's reign of three years and a few months was marked by tyranny and disorder, which caused widespread discontent among the soldiers and the officers, including his wise minister, 'Sayyid Husain, who was an Arab by descent. They besieged him in Gaur for four months, in the course of which he died. The nobles of Bengal then raised 'Sayyid Husain to the throne (1493), under the title of Alā-ud-dīn Husain Shah in recognition of his merit and ability.

[1] A modern writer notes that Sultan Shahzada was not an Abyssinian. Sukhamay Mukhopadhyay, p. 157).

The accession of 'Alā-ud-dīn Husain Shāh marks the commencement of the rule of a new dynasty, which endured about half a century and the members of which have various useful measures to their credit. He shifted his capital to Ekdala. We have numerous inscriptions of Husain Shāh, and his coins, as well as those of his son Nusrat Shāh, are varied and abundant. An enlightened and wise man, and a contemporary of the great Vaishnava preacher Chaitanya Deva, Husain Shāh was one of the most popular rulers that ascended the throne of Bengal. With a view to restoring order in the internal administration of his kingdom, he suppressed the power of the palace guards, who had, during the preceding reigns, established a position similar to that of the Praetorian Guards in Rome. He also expelled the Abyssinians from his kingdom, as their increased influence had become a serious menace to the throne. In A.D. 1494 he hospitably received Husain Shāh Sharqī of Jaunpur, who, being driven from his kingdom by Sikandar Lodī of Delhi, had fled towards Bengal. The fugitive monarch was allowed to live at Colgong (in Bihār near Bhāgalpur)[1] till he died there in A.D. 1500. At this Sikandar Lodī immediately decided to take action against the Bengal Sultan and sent an army to Bihār early in 1495 under Mahmud Lodī and Mubārak Lohāni. Husain Shāh of Bengal also sent an army under his son, Daniyal, to intercept them. The contending armies stood face to face at Barh for some time till peace was concluded between the two parties, on Husain Shāh giving an undertaking that in future he would not offer shelter to the enemies of the Delhi Sultan. Having established order near his capital, Husain Shāh tried to recover the lost territorial possessions of Bengal. He extended the limits of his kingdom as far as the borders of Orissa to the south, though he was not successful in his military campaigns against Orissa, recovered Magadha from the control of the Sharqīs of Jaunpur, occupied North Bihar, invaded the Āhom kingdom of Assam, and captured Kāmatāpur in Koch Bihār in 1498. Assam was soon recovered by its old king. Husain Shāh also annexed a tract of Tipperah and recovered Chittagong from Arrakanese occupation. Husain Shāh then applied himself to ensuring the security of the frontiers of his kingdom, and built mosques and alms-houses in different parts of it, making suitable endowments for their maintenance. He died in 1519 and was succeeded by his eldest son, Nasīb Khān, who assumed the title of Nāsir-ud-dīn Nusrat Shāh. Unlike many other Muslim rulers in India, Nusrat Shāh proved generous towards his brothers and

[1] There are several Muslim tombs at Colgong, one of which is regarded as the tomb of Husain Shāh Sharqī.

doubled their inheritance. He invaded Tirhut, slew its king Karsanārāyan and placed there 'Alā-ud-dīn and Makhdūm-i-'Ālam, his own brothers-in-law, to look after its administration. Nusrat Shāh's diplomacy to organise an anti-Mughal coalition did not prove quite successful and there was an open conflict between Babur's troops and Nusrat Shāh's army near the Ghoghra ferry in which the latter, after giving good account of themselves, were ultimately overpowered. This was followed by an agreement between Babur and Nusrat Shāh in 1529 on certain terms. Nusrat Shāh was a patron of art, architecture and literature. He caused two famous mosques, the *Barā Sonā Masjid* (Large Golden Mosque) and *Qadam Rasūl* (Foot of the Prophet), to be constructed at Gaur; and a Bengali version of the *Mahābhārata* was made under his orders. He was eventually assassinated by his palace eunuchs in 1532 and was succeeded by his son, 'Alā-ud-dīn Fīrūz Shāh, who, after a reign of not more than three months, was killed by his uncle, Ghiyās-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh. Ghiyās-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh was the last king of the Husain Shāhī dynasty, whom Sher Khān Sūr expelled from Bengal.

3. Independent Sultānates in the Provinces of Northern and Western India

A. Jaunpur

The city of Jaunpur was founded by Firūz of the house of Tughluq to perpetuate the memory of his cousin and patron, Muhammad Jauna. We have noticed before how, during the period of confusion following the invasion of Tīmūr, Khwāja Jahān threw off his allegiance to the Delhi Sultānate and founded a dynasty of independent rulers at Jaunpur, known as the Sharqī dynasty after his title, "*Malik-ush-Sharq*". He died in 1399, leaving his throne to his adopted son, Malik Qaranful, who assumed the title of Mubārak Shāh Sharqī. Mubārak Shāh died, after a short reign, in 1402, and was succeeded by his younger brother, Ibrāhīm Shāh Sharqī. Ibrāhīm ruled for about thirty-four years and was the ablest ruler of the Sharqī dynasty. Being himself a man of culture, he patronised art and literature, as a result of which Jaunpur became an important centre of Muslim learning. This city was also adorned by the construction of beautiful buildings, marked by Hindu influence, and having mosques without minarets of the usual type. The famous *Atāla Masjid* which stands now as a brilliant specimen of the Jaunpur style of architecture, was completed in A.D. 1408. Ibrāhīm died in 1436 and was succeeded by his son, Mahmūd Shāh. The new king annexed the greater part of the district of Chunār, but

his expedition against Kālpī proved unsuccessful. On making an attempt to occupy Delhi, he was defeated by Buhlūl Lodī, who compelled him to return to Jaunpur. Mahmud died in A.D. 1457, when his son, Bhīkhan, ascended the throne under the title of Muhammad Shāh. But the unscrupulous conduct of this king highly incensed the nobles and his own relatives, who had him murdered and raised his brother, Husain Shāh, to the throne. Soon after his accession, Husain Shāh concluded in 1458 a four years' truce with Buhlūl Lodī of Delhi. He utilised this period in suppressing the independent zamindārs of Tirhut, and in conducting a plundering expedition into Orissa, the Rājā of which purchased peace by paying a vast treasure. He also led an army in 1466 to capture the fortress of Gwālior, but could not reduce it and retired when its Rājā, Mān Singh, paid him a heavy indemnity. After these initial successes, fortune turned against Husain Shāh in his renewed war with Buhlūl Lodī, who expelled him to Bihār and annexed the kingdom of Jaunpur to Delhi. Buhlūl appointed his son, Bārbak, governor of Jaunpur, permitting him to use the royal title and coin money. Thus the independence of Jaunpur came to an end. The period of Sharqī rule at Jaunpur, extending for about eighty-five years, was marked by prosperity, development of architecture, and an outburst of a high type of culture, which earned for the city, during Ibrāhīm's reign, the title of "the Shīrāz of India".

B. Mālwa

Annexed by 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī in A.D. 1305, Mālwa continued to be governed by Muslim chiefs, under the authority of Delhi, till it became independent, like other provinces, during the period of disorder after the invasion of Tīmūr. Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī, who had been appointed governor of Mālwa, probably by Fīrūz of the house of Tughluq, made himself independent of the Delhi Sultānate for all practical purposes in 1401, though he did not formally renounce his allegiance to it or assume the "style of royalty". In 1406 he was succeeded by his ambitious son, Alp Khān, who ascended the throne under the title of Hūshang Shāh. The new ruler was a man of restless spirit, and took a delight in adventurous enterprises and wars, in which he remained constantly engaged throughout his reign. In 1422 he left his capital for Orissa in the guise of a merchant and made a surprise attack on the unsuspecting Rājā of that kingdom, who had to bribe him to withdraw by giving him seventy-five elephants. On his way back to Mālwa, Hūshang captured Kherla and carried off its Rājā as a prisoner. He had to

fight against the Sultāns of Delhi, Jaunpur, and Gujarāt, and had once to measure his strength with Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī, who had been offended by his capture of Kherla, the Rājā of which place had been formerly a vassal of the Bahmanī kingdom. But most of his campaigns resulted in defeats and disasters for him. He died on the 6th July, 1435, when his eldest son, Ghaznī Khān, was proclaimed king of Mālwa, under the title of Muhammad Shāh. But the new ruler was absolutely unmindful of the affairs of the State. His minister, Mahmūd Khān, usurped the throne in May, 1436. Thus was founded the dynasty of the Khaljī Sultāns of Mālwa. Mahmūd frustrated the opposition of a faction of the nobles, and of Ahmad Shāh I of Gujarāt, who had espoused the cause of Mas'ūd Khān, a son of Muhammad Shāh of Mālwa.

Mahmūd Khaljī was a brave warrior, who fought against Ahmad Shāh I of Gujarāt, Muhammad Shāh of Delhi, Muhammad Shāh III Bhamanī and Rānā Kumbha of Mewār. He failed in his contests with the Muslim Sultāns. His war with the Rānā of Mewār seems to have been indecisive. Strangely enough, both sides claimed victory, and while the Rānā of Mewār built the "Tower of Victory" at Chitor, the Sultān of Mālwa erected a seven-storeyed column at Māndū to commemorate his triumph. Mahmūd Khaljī was undoubtedly the ablest of the Muslim rulers of Mālwa. He extended the limits of this kingdom up to the Sātpurā Range in the south, the frontier of Gujarāt in the west, Bundelkhand in the east, and Mewār and Harautī in the north. His fame spread outside India. The Khalifah of Egypt recognised his position and he received a mission from Sultān Abu-Sa'īd. He was a just and active administrator. Ferishta thus praises his qualities: "Sultān Mahmūd was polite, brave, just and learned, and during his reign, his subjects, Muhammadans as well as Hindus, were happy and maintained a friendly intercourse with each other. Scarcely a year passed that he did not take the field, so that his tent became his home, and his resting-place the field of battle. His leisure hours were devoted to hearing the histories and memoirs of the courts of different kings of the earth read." He died at Māndū, at the age of sixty-eight, on the 1st June, 1469, after a reign of about thirty-four years.

Mahmūd's eldest son, Ghiyās-ud-dīn, ascended the throne of Mālwa two days after his father's death. He was a lover of peace and a devout Muslim, "particular in his daily prayers", and abstained from all intoxicants and prohibited articles of food. But his last days were rendered unhappy by quarrels between his two sons, 'Abdul Qādir Nāsir-ud-dīn and Shujā'at Khān 'Alā-ud-dīn. The

former at last seized the throne in A.D. 1500. Nāsir-ud-dīn greatly abused his power till he died in A.D. 1510. His second son then ascended the throne under the title of Mahmūd II. To get rid of the influence of the Muslim nobles, Mahmūd II appointed Medinī Rāi, the powerful Rājput chief of Chanderī, to the office of minister. Medinī Rāi soon acquired supreme influence in the State and appointed Hindus to offices of trust and responsibility. This excited the jealousy of the nobles of Mālwa, who removed the Rājput minister with the help of Sultan Muzaffar Shāh II of Gujarāt. But Medinī Rāi was able to inflict a defeat on Māhmūd II himself with the help of Rānā Sanga of Chitor. The Sultān of Mālwa was captured by the victorious Rājputs. Rānā Sanga, however, treated him with chivalrous generosity, characteristic of the Rājput race, and restored his vanquished foe to his kingdom. But the authority of the kingdom of Mālwa had been by this time greatly reduced, and the days of its independence were numbered. The Sultān, Mahmūd II, incurred the hostility of Rānā Ratan Singh, successor of Rānā Sanga, by raiding his territories; and the Rānā, as an act of reprisal, invaded Mālwa. He also excited the wrath of Sultān Bahādur Shāh of Gujarāt by giving shelter to Chānd Khān, the latter's younger brother and a rival for his throne. Bahādur Shāh thereupon captured Māndū on the 17th March, 1531, and the independence of Mālwa was thus extinguished. It continued to remain under Bahādur Shāh of Gujarāt, till it was later on occupied for a short period by the Mughul ruler, Humāyūn. About 1535 Mallū Khān, formerly an officer of the Khaljī Sultāns of Mālwa, established independent sovereignty in Mālwa under the title of Qādir Shāh, but he was deposed by Sher Shāh, the Afghan ruler of Delhi, in 1542. After being governed by viceroys of the Afghān government, Mālwa was conquered by Mughul generals from Bāz Bahādur in A.D. 1561–1562.

C. Gujarāt

The immense wealth of the province of Gujarāt, due particularly to active commerce through the rich ports of Cambay, Surāt and Broach, often drew upon her external invasions. Annexed to the Delhi Sultānate by 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī in A.D. 1297, it was ruled for a long time by Muslim governors appointed by the Delhi Sultāns. But in 1401 Zafar Khān (son of a Rājput convert), who had been appointed governor of the province in 1391 by Muhammad Shāh, the youngest son of Fīrūz of the house of Tughluq, formally assumed independence. In 1403 Zafar

Khān's son, Tātār Khān, acting in conspiracy with some discontented nobles, rose against his father, imprisoned him at Asāwal and proclaimed himself king under the title of Nāsir-ud-dīn Muhammad Shāh. He even marched towards Delhi with a view to establishing his authority there, but was put to death by his uncle and regent, Shams Khān. This enabled Zafar Khān to recover his throne and to assume the title of Sultān Muzaffar Shāh. Muzaffar Shāh waged a successful war against Hūshang Shāh, Sultān of Mālwa, and captured Dhār. After his death in June, 1411, Ahmad Shāh, his grandson and heir-designate, ascended the throne. Ahmad has been justly regarded as the real founder of the independence of Gujarāt. Endowed with considerable courage and energy, he engaged himself throughout his reign of about thirty years in extending the limits of his kingdom, which had been confined, during the reigns of his two predecessors, to a small territory near Asāwal. Success always attended his campaigns against the Sultān of Mālwa and the chiefs of Asīrgarh, Rājputāna and other neighbouring territories. He also devoted his attention to improving the civil administration of his kingdom and dispensed justice impartially. In the first year of his reign, he built the beautiful city of Ahmadābād, on the site of the old town of Asāwal, and removed his capital to that place, which to this day bears witness to his taste and munificence. His only defect was his religious intolerance. He died on the 16th August, 1442, and was succeeded by his eldest son, Muhammad Shāh, who reigned till his death on the 10th February, A.D. 1451. Two weak rulers, Muhammad Shāh's son, Qutb-ud-dīn Ahmad, and Muhammad's brother Dāūd, followed him. Through his evil ways, Dāūd alienated the sympathy of the nobles within a few days of his accession. They deposed him, and raised his nephew, Abul Fath Khān, a grandson of Ahmad Shāh, to the throne, under the title of Mahmūd, commonly known as Begarha.

Mahmūd Begarha was by far the most eminent Sultān of his dynasty. The leading Muslim historian of his country observes that "he added glory and lustre to the kingdom of Gujarāt, and was the best of all the Gujarāt kings, including all who preceded, and all who succeeded him; and whether for abounding justice and generosity . . . for the diffusion of the laws of Islam and of Mussalmāns; for soundness in judgment, alike in boyhood, in manhood, and in old age; for power, for valour, and victory, he was a pattern of excellence". Ascending the throne at a comparatively young age, he at once took the management of the affairs of his kingdom into his own hands, and overpowered his hostile courtiers,

who had formed a conspiracy to raise his brother, Hasan Khān, to the throne. He ruled vigorously, without the influence of any minister or of the harem, for about fifty-three years; and being a brave warrior, he gained success in all his campaigns. He saved Nizām Shāh Bahmanī from aggression on the part of Mahmūd Khaljī of Mālwa, defeated the Sūmra and Sodha chiefs of Cutch, suppressed the pirates of Jagat (Dvārakā), and reduced the strong forts of Junāgarh and Chāmpāner, the latter being named by him Muhammadābād. As a result of his conquests, the kingdom of Gujarāt reached its extreme limits, extending "from the frontiers of Māndū to the frontiers of Sind, by Junāgarh; to the Siwālik Parbat by Jālor and Nāgaur; to Nāsik Trimbak by Baglāna; from Burhānpur to Berar and Malkāpur of the Deccan; to Karkūn and the river Narbada on the side of Burhānpur; on the side of Īdar as far as Chitor and Kūmbhalgarh, and on the side of the sea as far as the bounds of Chaul". Towards the close of his reign, he tried, in alliance with Qansauh-al-Ghaurī, Sultān of Egypt, to check the rising power of the Portuguese in the Indian Seas, who had within a decade, since the discovery of the Cape Route by Vasco da Gama in 1498, almost monopolised the lucrative spice trade from the Red Sea and Egypt at the expense of the interests of Muslim traders and the important sea-ports of Western India, like Cambay and Chaul. The Egyptian fleet, under the command of Amīr Husain the Kurd, governor of Jedda, and the Indian contingent, under the command of Malik Ayāz, a Turk who had found employment in the court of Gujarāt, defeated a Portuguese squadron commanded by Dom Lourenço, son of the Portuguese viceroy, Francesco de Almeida, near Chaul, south of Bombay, in 1508. But the Portuguese inflicted a crushing defeat on the allied Muslim fleet, near Diu, in 1509, and recovered their naval ascendancy on the sea-coast. Mahmūd granted them a site for a factory at Diu.

After the death of Mahmūd Begarha on the 23rd November, 1511, the throne passed to his son Muzaffar II, who waged successful wars against the Rājputs and restored Mahmūd Khaljī of Mālwa to his throne. Muzaffar's death on the 7th April, 1526, was followed by two short and insignificant reigns of his sons, Sikandar and Nāsir Khān Mahmūd II, till in the month of July of the same year his more daring son, Bahādur, got possession of the throne.

Brave and warlike like his grandfather, Bahādur was a famous ruler in the history of medieval India. He not only defeated Mahmūd II of Mālwa and annexed his kingdom in 1531 but also overran the territories of the Rānā of Mewār, the old enemy of his house, and stormed Chitor in A.D. 1534. Fortune, however,

went against him in his wars with Humāyūn, in the course of which he was deprived not only of the newly-conquered province of Mālwa but also of the greater part of his own kingdom. But on the withdrawal of the Delhi troops, Bahādur regained his kingdom and turned his attention towards expelling the Portuguese, whose assistance he had sought in vain against the Mughuls. Failing to persuade the Portuguese governor, Nunho da Cunha, to come to him, he himself proceeded to visit him on board his ship in February, 1537, but was treacherously drowned by the Portuguese, and all his companions were murdered. After the death of Bahādur, anarchy and confusion reigned supreme in Gujarāt under his weak successors, who were mere puppets in the hands of rival baronial parties; so it was easily annexed to the Mughul Empire by Akbar in A.D. 1572.

D. Kāshmīr

In the year A.D. 1315 Shāh Mirzā, a Muslim adventurer from Swāt, entered the service of the Hindu Prince of Kāshmīr, who died shortly afterwards. Shāh Mirzā seized the throne of Kāshmīr in A.D. 1339 or 1346 under the title of Shams-ud-dīn Shāh and caused coins to be struck and the *Khutba* to be read in his name. He used his newly-acquired power wisely, and died in A.D. 1349.[1] His sons, Jamshīd, 'Alā-ud-dīn, Shihāb-ud-dīn, and Qutb-ud-dīn, then reigned successively for about forty-six years. After Qutb-ud-dīn's death in A.D. 1394, his son Sikandar ascended the throne of Kāshmīr.

Reigning at the time of Tīmūr's invasion of India, Sikandar exchanged envoys with him, though the two never met each other. He was generous towards the men of his own faith, and many learned Muslim scholars flocked to his court from Persia, Arabia and Mesopotamia, but his general attitude was not liberal. He died, after a reign of twenty-two years and nine months, in A.D. 1416. His eldest son, 'Ālī Shāh, then reigned for a few years, after which he was overpowered by his brother, Shāhī Khān, who ascended the throne in June, A.D. 1420, under the title of Zain-ul-'Ābidīn.

Zain-ul-'Ābidīn was a benevolent, liberal and enlightened ruler. He did much to diminish theft and highway robbery in his kingdom by enforcing the principle of the responsibility of the village communities for local crimes, regulated the prices of commodities,

[1] The chronology of the Muhammadan Sultāns of Kāshmīr is rather bewildering, and the dates of their reigns have to be regarded as being approximate.

lightened the burden of taxation on the people, and rehabilitated the currency, which had been greatly debased during the reigns of his predecessors. His public works immensely benefited his subjects. He was a man of liberal ideas, and showed remarkable toleration towards the followers of other faiths. He recalled the Brāhmaṇas, who had left the kingdom during his father's reign, admitted learned Hindus to his society, abolished the *jizya* and granted perfect religious freedom to all. He possessed a good knowledge of Persian, Hindi, and Tibetan, besides his own language, and patronised literature, painting and music. Under his initiative, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rājataraṅginī* were translated from Sanskrit into Persian, and several Arabic and Persian books were translated into the Hindi language. Thus, for all these qualities, he has been justly described as "the Akbar of Kāshmīr", though he differed from him in a few traits of personal character. He died in November or December, 1470, and was succeeded by his son Haidar Shāh.

The history of the later Sultāns of Kāshmīr is uninteresting and unimportant. After Zain-ul-'Ābidīn's death, anarchy "ensued under the rule of nominal kings who were placed on the throne as a mark for the machinations of the different parties who were seeking pre-eminence for purposes of self-aggrandisement and plunder". Towards the end of A.D. 1540, Mirzā Haidar, a relative of Humāyūn, conquered Kāshmīr. He governed it, theoretically, on behalf of Humāyūn, but in practice as an independent ruler, till 1551, when he was overthrown by the Kāshmīr nobles, who resumed their intrigues and quarrels. About A.D. 1555 the Chakks seized the throne of Kāshmīr, but with no relief to the troubled kingdom, which was absorbed into the Mughul Empire in the time of Akbar.

4. Independent Sultānates in Southern India, including Khāndesh

A. Khāndesh

Khāndesh was a province of Muhammad bin Tughluq's empire in the valley of the Tāptī river. Fīrūz Shāh entrusted its government to one of his personal attendants, Malik Rājā Fārūqī, whose ancestors had been respected nobles of the Delhi court in the reigns of 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī and Muhammad bin Tughluq. In the period of confusion following the death of Fīrūz Shāh, Malik Rājā, following the example of his neighbour, Dilāwar Khān of Mālwa, declared his independence of the Delhi Sultānate. He was defeated by Muzaffar Shāh I of Gujarāt in several battles. Being a

man of peaceful disposition, he treated his subjects, Muhammadans as well as Hindus, with kindness and consideration. He died on the 29th April, 1399, and his son, Malik Nasīr, soon made himself absolute master of Khāndesh by overpowering his brother Hasan. The new Sultān captured the fortress of Asīrgarh from its Hindu chieftain, but Ahmad Shāh, the Sultān of Gujarāt, defeated him when he attacked Nandurbār and compelled him to swear fealty to him. His war against his son-in-law, 'Alā-ud-dīn Ahmad of the Bahmanī dynasty, also ended in disaster for him and he died in the year 1437–1438. Then after the two uneventful reigns of his son, 'Ādil Khān I (1438–41), and grandson, Mubārak Khān I (1441–1457), the throne of Khāndesh was occupied by Mubārak Khān's son, 'Ādil Khān II, who was an able and vigorous ruler and tried hard to restore administrative order in his kingdom, the authority of which was extended by him over Gondwāna. On his death without any issue in 1501, the throne passed to his brother Dāūd, who, after an inglorious reign of about seven years, died in 1508, and was succeeded by his son, Ghaznī Khān. Ghaznī Khān was poisoned within ten days of his accession, and Khāndesh was plunged into disorder due to the faction fights of two rival claimants to its throne, one being supported by Ahmad Nizām Shāh of Ahmadnagar, and the other by Mahmūd Begarha of Gujarāt, till the latter succeeded in raising his candidate to the throne with the title of 'Ādil Khān III. The reign of 'Ādil Khān III was not marked by any event of importance. He died on the 25th August, 1520, and his weak successors had not the courage or ability to save the kingdom from the aggressions of its external enemies. Like Gujarāt, Khāndesh was annexed by Akbar to his empire in 1601.

B. The Bahmanī Kingdom

Of all the independent Muslim kingdoms that arose on the ruins of the Delhi Sultānate, the Bahmanī kingdom of the Deccan proved to be the most powerful. It came into existence during the reign of Muhammad bin Tughluq as a challenge to his authority. The nobles of the Deccan, driven to rebellion by the eccentric policy of the Delhi Sultān, seized the fort of Daulatābād and proclaimed one of themselves, Ismā'īl Mukh the Afghān, as king of the Deccan under the title of Nāsir-ud-dīn Shāh. Ismā'īl Mukh, being an old and ease-loving man, proved unfit for the office. Soon he voluntarily made room for a more worthy leader, Hasan, entitled Zafar Khān, who was declared king by the nobles on the 3rd August, 1347, under the title of Abul-Muzaffar 'Alā-ud-dīn Bahman

Shāh. The story related by Ferishta about Hasan's origin, to the effect that he was originally a menial in the service of a Brāhmaṇa astrologer of Delhi, Gangū, who enjoyed the favour of Muhammad bin Tughluq, and later on rose to prominence owing to the patronage of his Hindu master, finds no corroboration in the accounts of the later Muslim chroniclers and is also not supported by the evidence of coins and inscriptions. Hasan, in fact, claimed descent from the famous Persian hero Bahman, son of Isfandiyār, and the dynasty that he founded thus came to be known as the Bahmanī dynasty.

Soon after his accession, 'Alā-ud-dīn Hasan selected Gulbarga as his capital and renamed it as Ahsanābād. But the Hindu rulers of the south, who had not failed to profit by the political disorders in the Deccan at the time of 'Alā-ud-dīn Hasan's rise, were not disposed to submit to his authority. He therefore launched on a career of conquest, which was marked by success. When he died on the 11th February, 1358, he left a dominion extending from the Waingangā river in the north to the Kṛishṇā river in the south and from Daulatābād in the west to Bhongīr, now in the Nizām's dominions, in the east. For the administration of his kingdom, he divided it into four *tarafs* or provinces, Gulbarga, Daulatābād, Berar and Bīdar. Each province was placed in charge of a governor, who maintained an army, and made appointments in all civil and military posts under him. The efficiency of administration in the provinces checked the outbreak of rebellions. The author of *Burhān-i-Ma'āsir* has thus praised this Sultān: "Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn I Hasan Shāh was a just king and the cherisher of his people and pious. During his reign his subjects and the army used to pass their time in perfect ease and content; and he did much towards propagating the true faith."

The next Sultān was Muhammad Shāh I, the eldest son of Hasan, who had nominated him as his heir on his death-bed. Soon after his accession, Muhammad Shāh organised the different branches of his government, like the ministry, the household troops and the provincial administration. But throughout his reign, he was chiefly engaged in waging wars against the rulers of Warangal and Vijayanagar. Those rulers offered a stubborn resistance, but both were overpowered by the troops of Gulbarga, and had to conclude peace, after immense losses, on humiliating terms.

Muhammad Shāh's mode of life was not unimpeachable. The author of *Burhān-i-Ma'āsir* distinctly states that the Sultān "showed signs of an irreligious manner of living, which threw him on the bed of helplessness".

After the death of Muhammad Shāh I in A.D. 1377, his son, Mujāhid Shāh, ascended the throne and marched in person against Vijayanagar. But he could not capture that city and soon had to return to his capital after making peace with its Rāya. He fell a victim to a conspiracy organised by one of his near relatives named Dāūd Khān,[1] who usurped the throne. The usurper was paid back in his own coin by being murdered in May, 1378, by an assassin at the instigation of Mujāhid's foster-sister, Rūh Parwar Āghā. The nobles and military officers then raised to the throne Muhammad Shāh, son of Mahmūd Khān, the fourth son of 'Alā-ud-dīn Hasan Bahmanī.

Unlike his predecessors, Muhammad Shāh II was a lover of peace and devoted to learning; and his reign was not disturbed by foreign wars. He built mosques, established free schools for orphans, and invited learned men from all parts of Asia to his court. But his last days were embittered by the intrigues of his sons, who were eager to get the throne. After his death in April, A.D. 1397, followed the inglorious and troubled reigns of his two sons, Ghiyās-ud-dīn and Shams-ud-dīn Dāūd, lasting for only a few months, till the throne of Gulbarga was seized in November, 1397, by Fīrūz, a grandson of 'Alā-ud-dīn Hasan Bahmanī, who assumed the title of Tāj-ud-dīn Fīrūz Shāh.

We are told by the author of *Burhān-i-Ma'āsir* that Fīrūz Shāh "was an impetuous and a mighty monarch, and expended all his ability and energy in eradicating and destroying tyranny and heresy, and he took much pleasure in the society of the *Shekhs*, learned men and hermits". But after a few years' rule, he became addicted to the common vices of his time, which even Ferishta has noted. He was conversant with various languages and could talk freely with his wives of diverse nationalities in their own tongues. He followed the traditional policy of his dynasty in waging wars against the Rāyas of Vijayanagar and some other Hindu rulers of the Deccan. He gained success in his two expeditions against Vijayanagar in 1398 and 1406, exacted heavy indemnity from its Rāya and even compelled him to surrender a princess of Vijayanagar for his harem. But his third attack in 1420 resulted in his defeat at Pāngul, to the north of the Kṛishṇā, and his retreat from the field after his commander-in-chief, Mīr Fazl-ullāh Injū, had been killed. The Vijayanagar troops soon occupied the southern and eastern districts of the Bahmanī kingdom. This defeat told heavily on the Sultān's mind and body, and he left

[1] Dāūd was uncle of Mujāhid according to Ferishta but his cousin according to the author of *Burhān-i-Ma'āsir*.

the administration in the hands of his slaves, Hūshyār 'Ain-ul-mulk and Nizām Bīdār-ul-mulk. He was ultimately forced to abdicate the throne in favour of his brother Ahmad, who, according to the author of *Burhān-i-Ma'āsir*, did away with Fīrūz Shāh in September, 1422, though some writers believe, on the authority of Ferishta, that Fīrūz Shāh died a natural death.

To avenge the losses sustained by the Bahmanī troops in his brother's reign, Ahmad Shāh carried on a terrible war against Vijayanagar. The siege of Vijayanagar by the Bahmanī troops reduced it to great distress and compelled its Rāya to conclude peace by paying a heavy indemnity. This was conveyed to Ahmad's camp, on elephants, by the Rāya's son, who was received there honourably; and the invaders then returned to their country. In 1424 or 1425 Ahmad Shāh's general, Khān-i-'Azam, attacked the Hindu kingdom of Warangal and succeeded in capturing its fortress, with immense treasures, and in killing its ruler. The independence of Warangal was thus extinguished. Ahmad Shāh also waged war against Mālwa. The Sultān of Mālwa, Hūshang Shāh, was defeated with great losses in men and money. Ahmad's war with the Sultān of Gujarāt, Ahmad Shāh I, ended in failure, and peace was at last concluded through the intervention of theologians and learned men of both sides. The Hindu chiefs of the Konkan also felt the weight of Bahmanī arms during his reign, but this pressure was removed after his death from illness in February, 1435.

Ahmad Shāh transferred the capital of his kingdom from Gulbarga to Bīdar, which was beautifully situated and had a salubrious climate. Though not endowed with much learning, he bestowed favours on some Muslim scholars. The poet, Shaikh Āzarī of Isfarāyīn in Khurāsān, who came to his court, received a huge amount of money for composing two verses in praise of his palace at Bīdar; and Maulāna Sharf-ud-dīn Māzandarānī was also rewarded with 12,000 *tankās* for inscribing in beautiful handwriting two verses on the door of that palace.

In the meanwhile, baronial intrigues for position and influence, often resulting in pitched battles and massacres, had begun to affect the homogeneity of the Bahmanī kingdom. There were perpetual feuds between the Deccani nobles with their allies, the Africans and the *Muwallads* (issue of African fathers and Indian mothers) on the one side, and, on the other, the foreign nobles, composed of the Turks, the Arabs, the Persians and the Mughuls. Many of the latter had been elevated to high offices in the State, for their hardy and active habits, in preference to the children of the soil, who grew jealous of them. This jealousy was

accentuated by religious differences, for while most of the Deccanis were Sunnīs, the majority of the rival party consisted of Shiahs. Thus the history of the later Bahmanīds is a dreary tale of conspiracies and strife, which sucked the life-blood of the kingdom till it finally disintegrated.

Ahmad was succeeded peacefully by his eldest son under the title of 'Alā-ud-dīn II. Soon after his accession, 'Alā-ud-dīn II suppressed a rebellion headed by his brother Muhammad, who was, however, pardoned and given the government of the Rāichūr Doāb, where he remained faithful during the rest of his life. The Hindu chiefs of the Konkan were next reduced to submission, and the Rājā of Sangameshwar gave his beautiful daughter in marriage to the Bahmanī Sultān. This was not liked by the Sultān's Muslim wife Malikā-i-Jahān. At her request her father, Nasīr Khān, the ruler of Khāndesh, invaded Berar, but was defeated by Malik-ul-Tujjār Khalaf Hasan, governor of Daulatābād and leader of the foreign nobles. In 1443 'Alā-ud-dīn waged war against Vijayanagar, the Rāya of which had to conclude peace by promising regular payment of tribute in future. Ferishta writes that at this time the Rāya of Vijayanagar employed Muslim soldiers in his army, admitted some Muslims into his service, and even erected a mosque at the capital city for their worship. Like other Sultāns of the dynasty, 'Alā-ud-dīn was a zealous champion of Islam and was benevolent towards the followers of his own faith. We know from Ferishta and the author of *Burhān-i-Ma'āsir* that he "founded *masjids*, public schools and charitable institutions, among which was a hospital of perfect elegance and purity of style, which he built in his capital, Bīdar, and made two beautiful villages there as a pious endowment, in order that the revenue of these villages should be solely devoted to supplying medicines and drinks . . . so much did he attend to carrying out the orders and prohibitions of the divine *law* that even the name of wine and all intoxicating liquors was abrogated in his jurisdiction. . . ."

'Alā-ud-dīn died peacefully in April, 1457, and was succeeded by his eldest son, Humāyūn, who was so cruel as to get the epithet of "*Zālim*" or "the Tyrant". Examples of his cruelties have been cited by the author of *Burhān-i-Ma'āsir*. Humāyūn died a natural death, according to some writers, in October, 1461, but the more reliable authorities write that he was murdered by some of his servants when he was in a state of intoxication. His death freed his people "from the *talons* of his tortures" and the general sense of relief was thus expressed by the contemporary poet Nazir:

"Humāyūn Shāh has passed away from the world,
God Almighty, what a blessing was the death of Humāyūn!
On the date of his death the world was full of delight,
So, 'delight of the world' gave the date of his death."

According to the chroniclers Humāyūn's minor son, Nizām Shāh, was next raised to the throne. The queen-mother, Makhdūmah Jahān, tried to manage the administration of the State with the assistance of Khwāja Jahān and Khwāja Mahmūd Gāwān. But the rulers of Orissa and Telingāna were emboldened, during the rule of the boy king, to attack his kingdom. They were driven back with heavy losses. But soon a more formidable danger appeared for the Bahmanīs when Mahmūd Khaljī I of Mālwa led an invasion into their territories and besieged Bīdar, which was saved only when Mahmūd Begarha, the Sultān of Gujarāt, sent a favourable response to the Bahmanī Sultān's appeal for help. Nizām Shāh died very suddenly, on the 30th July, 1463, and his brother, aged only nine, ascended the throne under the title of Muhammad III.

Soon after Muhammad's accession, the old minister Khwāja Jahān, who aimed at a monopoly of power in the State, was put to death through the influence of the queen-mother, and the vacant office was entrusted to Mahmūd Gāwān, who received the title of Khwāja Jahān. Though possessed of wide powers, Mahmūd Gāwān never abused his authority. By virtue of his conspicuous ability, he served the Bahmanī State with unstinted loyalty; and, by skilful diplomacy and successful military operations, he brought the dominions of the Bahmanīs "to an extent never achieved by former sovereigns".

In 1469 Mahmūd Gāwān marched with an army to subdue the Hindu Rājās of the Konkan, and when he succeeded in capturing several forts, the Rājā of Sangameshwar, overpowered with fear, surrendered the fortress of Khelna to his agents. "This unrivalled minister," writes the author of *Burhān-i-Ma'āsir*, "seized many forts and towns and captured immense booty, and valuable goods, such as horses, elephants, maidens, and female slaves, as well as precious jewels and pearls, fell into the minister's hands." He also captured Goa, one of the best ports of the Vijayanagar Empire. In the meanwhile, Nizām-ul-mulk Barhi, a commander of the Bahmanī kingdom, had seized the forts of Rajamundry and Kondavīr. In the year 1474 the Deccan was devastated by a terrible famine due to the failure of rain for two successive years, and many succumbed to its rigours. When rain at last fell in

the third year, scarcely any farmers remained in the country to cultivate the land.

But the military enterprises of the Sultān continued unabated. In February, 1478, Muhammad invaded and devastated Orissa, the Rājā of which induced him to withdraw by presenting to him some elephants and other valuable gifts.

The most successful military exploit of his reign was directed, in the course of a war with Vijayanagar, against Kāñchī or Conjeeveram (12th March, 1481), a seat of some old temples, which "were the wonder of the age, filled with countless concealed treasures and jewels, and valuable pearls, besides innumerable slave-girls". The besieged soldiers offered a brave resistance but were ultimately vanquished by the Bahmanī troops, who captured an immense booty.

The military record of Muhammad Shah III's reign is indeed one of triumph. But his own voluptuousness, and the selfish intrigues of the nobles of his court, stood in the path of his progress in other respects, and ultimately caused his ruin. Being addicted to hard drinking, the Sultān became mentally unbalanced as years rolled on, and took a suicidal step by passing the death sentence on Mahmūd Gāwān on 5th April, 1481, at the instigation of his enemies, the Deccani nobles, who, being jealous of his power and success, produced a forged letter to persuade the Sultān to believe in the minister's treasonable correspondence with the Rāya of Vijayanagar. Thus Mahmūd Gāwān, who had served the Bahmanī kingdom as minister in three successive reigns with efficiency and honesty, for which he was entitled to the gratitude of his master, fell a prey to a conspiracy organised by a rival baronial clique, blind to the true interests of the State. With the unjust execution of this old minister "departed," remarks Meadows Taylor rightly, "all the cohesion and power of the Bahmanī kingdom". In many respects, Mahmūd Gāwān's character was far superior to that of his contemporaries. Leading a simple and pure life, he was fond of learning and the society of the learned, which led him to maintain a magnificent college and a vast library at Bīdar; and his disinterested services as a public officer justly entitle him to our praise. Muhammad III discovered his own folly rather too late, and, seized with grief and remorse, he expired within a year on the 22nd March, A.D. 1482.

The Bahmanī kingdom was henceforth thrown into utter confusion, leading to its inevitable collapse. Mahmūd Shāh, the younger son and successor of Muhammad III, had neither the strength of personal character, nor the guidance of an able minister

to enable him to maintain the integrity of his kingdom. The feud between the Deccanis and the foreigners continued with unabated fury and rancour. The provincial governors availed themselves of the prevailing confusion to declare their independence. The nominal authority of Mahmūd came to be confined within a small area round the capital, and he and his four successors remained mere puppets in the hands of Qāsim Barīd-ul-Mamālik, a clever noble of Turkish origin, and after his death in 1504, in those of his son 'Amīr 'Ālī Barīd, "the fox of the Deccan". The last ruler, Kalīmullah Shāh, secretly tried to secure the help of Bābur to restore the lost fortunes of his dynasty, but was sadly disappointed. With his death in 1527 the Bahmanī dynasty came to an end after about one hundred and eighty years' rule.

The history of the Bahmanī dynasty in the Deccan on the whole offers no pleasant reading. Most of its Sultāns employed themselves chiefly in terrible wars, and its internal politics were severely distracted by court intrigues and civil strife. Among the eighteen kings of this dynasty, five were murdered, two died of intemperance, and three were deposed, two of them being blinded. The Bahmani Sultāns should, however, be credited with patronage of learning and education according to their lights, erection of fortresses and buildings, and construction of irrigation works in the eastern provinces, which benefited the peasantry while securing more revenues to the State.

We get a glimpse of the condition of the common people in the Bahmanī kingdom from certain observations made by the Russian traveller, Althanasius Nikitin, who travelled in this kingdom during the years 1470 to 1474 in the reign of Muhammad Shāh III. He writes: "The Sultān is a little man, twenty years old, in the power of the nobles. . . . The Sultān goes out with 300,000 men of his own troops. The land is overstocked with people; but those in the country are very miserable, whilst the nobles are extremely opulent and delight in luxury. They are wont to be carried on their silver beds, preceded by some 20 chargers caparisoned in gold, and followed by 300 men on horseback and by 500 on foot, and by hornmen, ten torch-bearers, and ten musicians.

"The Sultān goes out hunting with his mother and his lady, and a train of 10,000 men on horseback, 50,000 on foot; 200 elephants adorned in gilded armour, and in front 100 horsemen, 100 dancers, and 300 common horses in golden clothing; 100 monkeys and 100 concubines, all foreign."

Thus the testimony of a foreign traveller tells us that the lot of the common people was hard as compared with the luxurious

standard of living of the nobility. But there is no other positive evidence to enable us to form an accurate picture of the condition of the mass of the people during the whole of the Bahmanī period. The accounts of the Muslim chroniclers are full of details regarding military campaigns and wars against infidels, without any reference to the history of the people.

C. The Five Sultānates of the Deccan

Five separate Sultānates arose in the Deccan, one after another, on the break-up of the Bahmanī kingdom. These were known, after the titles of their founders, as the Imād Shāhī dynasty of Berar, the Nizām Shāhī dynasty of Ahmadnagar, the 'Ādil Shāhī dynasty of Bijāpur, the Qutb Shāhī dynasty of Golkundā and the Bārīd Shāhī dynasty of Bīdar. The first to secede was Berar, where Fathullāh Imād Shāh, a Hindu convert, declared his independence in A.D. 1484 and founded the Imād Shāhī dynasty. Berar was absorbed by Ahmadnagar in A.D. 1574.

Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān, Governor of Bijāpur, asserted his independence in A.D. 1489–1490. He was known during his early days as a Georgian slave, who was purchased by Mahmūd Gāwān, and rose to prominence by dint of his merit and ability. Ferishta, however, relying on some private information, writes that he was the son of Sultān Murād II of Turkey, who died in A.D. 1451, that he fled from his country, first to Persia, and then to India at the age of seventeen, to save himself from assassination, ordered by his elder brother, Muhammad II, who had succeeded his father on the throne, and that he sold himself as a slave to the minister of the Bahmanī Sultān. Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh was not a bigot. Religion was no bar to securing offices in his government, and he had a preference for the Shiah creed, probably due to his sojourn in Persia. Free from vices in his private life, he was mindful of his duties as a ruler. Ferishta tells us that although Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh "mingled pleasure with business, yet he never allowed the former to interfere with the latter. He always warned his ministers to act with justice and integrity, and in his own person showed them an example of attention to those virtues. He invited to his court many learned men and valiant officers from Persia, Turkestān, and Rum, and also several eminent artists, who lived happy under the shadow of his bounty. In his reign the citadel of Bijāpur was made of stone". The reigns of Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh's four immediate successors, Ismā'īl 'Ādil Shāh, son of Yūsuf (1510–1534), Mallū, son of Ismā'īl (1534), Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh I, brother of Mallū (1534–1557), and 'Alī

'Ādil Shāḥ, son of Ibrāhīm (1557–1579), were full of intrigues and wars. But the dynasty produced another remarkable ruler in Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh II, nephew and successor of 'Ālī 'Ādil Shāh, who governed the kingdom with universal toleration and wisdom till he died in A.D. 1626. In the opinion of Meadows Taylor, who wrote with some experience of Bijāpur and its local traditions, "he was the greatest of all the 'Ādil Shāhī dynasty, and in most respects, except its founder, the most able and popular". The Bijāpur kingdom survived till its annexation by Aurangzeb in A.D. 1686.

The founder of the Ahmadnagar kingdom was Malik Ahmad, son of Nizām-ul-mulk Bahri, who sprang from the hereditary Hindu revenue officials of Pāthrī, north of the Godāvarī, took a leading part in the conspiracy against Mahmūd Gāwān, and became prime minister after his death. Malik Ahmad was appointed governor of Junnar, but in 1490 he declared himself independent. Some time later he transferred the seat of his government to a place of better strategic position and thus founded the city of Ahmadnagar. After several years' attempts, he captured Daulatābād in A.D. 1499, which helped him to consolidate his dominion. He died in A.D. 1508 and was succeeded by his son, Burhān Nizām Shāh, who, during his reign of forty-five years, waged wars with the neighbouring States and about A.D. 1550 allied himself with the Rāya of Vijayanagar against Bijāpur. His successor, Husain Nizām Shāh, joined the Muslim confederacy against Vijayanagar in 1565. After his death in that year, he was succeeded by his son, Murtazā Nizām Shāh I, a pleasure-loving youth, unfit to compete successfully with his adversaries. There is nothing of importance and interest in the subsequent history of Ahmadnagar except the heroic resistance offered by Chānd Bibi to Akbar's son, Prince Murād, in 1595, and the military as well as administrative skill of Malik 'Ambar. The kingdom was overrun by the Mughuls in 1600, but it was not finally annexed to their Empire until 1633 in the reign of Shāh Jahān.

The Muslim kingdom of Golkundā grew up on the ruins of the old Hindu kingdom of Warangal, which was conquered by the Bahmanīs in A.D. 1424. The founder of the Qutb Shāhī dynasty was Qulī Shāh, a Turki officer of the Bahmanī kingdom during the reign of Mahmūd Shāh Bahmanī. He was appointed governor of Telingāna by Mahmūd Gāwān and remained loyal to his master till, as a protest against the power and insolence of the Barīds, he declared his independence in A.D. 1512 or 1518. He had a long and prosperous reign till he was murdered at the age of ninety in 1543

by his son Jamshīd, who reigned for seven years. Jamshīd's brother and successor, Ibrāhīm, fought against Vijayanagar in 1565 in alliance with the other Muslim Sultānates. He was a good ruler and freely admitted the Hindus to high offices in the State. After his death in 1611, the history of Golkundā was largely entangled with that of the Mughul Empire till it was annexed to it by Aurangzeb in 1687.

When the distant provinces of the Bahmanī kingdom declared their independence, the remnant of it survived only in name under the ascendancy of the Barīds. In 1526 or 1527 Amīr 'Ālī Barīd formally dispensed with the rule of the puppet Bahmanī Sultāns and founded the Bārīd Shāhī dynasty of Bīdar, which lasted till its territory was absorbed by Bijāpur in A.D. 1618–1619.

The five offshoots of the Bahmanī kingdom had some good rulers, notably in Bijāpur and Golkundā. The history of these Sultānates is largely a record of almost continuous quarrel with one another and with Vijayanagar. Each aspired to the supremacy of the Deccan, which was consequently turned into a scene of internal warfare, similar to what went on between the Chalukyas and the Pallavas in earlier days, or between Mysore, the Marāthas and the Nizām in the eighteenth century. The disruption of the Bahmanī kingdom, and the dissensions among the five Sultānates that rose on its ruins, seriously hampered the progress of Islam, political as well as religious, in the south, where the spirit of Hindu revival, that had manifested itself since the days of the Tughluqs, culminated in the rise and growth of the Vijayanagar Empire.

5. The Hindu Kingdoms—The Vijayanagar Empire

A. Political History

The early history of Vijayanagar is still shrouded in obscurity. Sewell, after referring to several traditional accounts about the origin of the great imperial city, remarks that "perhaps the most reasonable account would be culled from the general drift of the Hindu legends combined with the certainties of historical fact" He accepts the tradition according to which five sons of Sangama, of whom Harihara and Bukka were the most eminent, laid the foundation of the city and kingdom of Vijayanagar, on the southern bank of the Tungabhadrā facing the fortress of Anegundī on the northern bank. They got inspiration for their enterprise from the celebrated Brāhmaṇa sage and scholar of the day, Mādhava Vid-

vāraṇya, and his brother Sāyana, the famous commentator on the Vedas. This tradition is regarded by some as a later fabrication which found currency in the sixteenth century. In the opinion of Rev. Father Heras, the foundation of the city of Anegundī, which formed the cradle of the Vijayanagar Empire, was laid by the Hoysala king Vīra Ballāla III, and Harihara, a near relative of the Hoysala ruling family, was a frontier officer with his headquarters there. According to another writer, "the fortification of the city that afterwards became Vijayanagar must be regarded as the deliberate act of the great Hoysala ruler, Vīra Ballāla III. It was founded soon after the destruction of Kampilī by the army of Muhammad Tughluq, and immediately following the invasion of the Hoysala capital, Dorasamudra . The theory of Hoysala origin has been recently challenged by a writer who, in discussing the question from different sources, has argued that Harihara and Bukka founded the city and that they "shaped the course of their conduct" on the advice of Mādhava Vidyāraṇya, who is described in an inscription of Harihara II as "the supreme light incarnate". According to some authorities, the five brothers were fugitives from the Telugu country included in the Kākatīya kingdom of Warangal, the capital of which was captured by the Muhammadans in 1424. In the midst of these conflicting opinions, this much can be said with certainty, that Harihara and Bukka and their three brothers made earnest efforts to organise resistance against the advance of the invaders from the north. The significance of the Vijayanagar Empire in the history of India is that for well nigh three centuries it stood for the older religion and culture of the country and saved these from being engulfed by the rush of new ideas and forces. It also indirectly prevented the extension of the influence of the Bahmanī kingdom and its offshoots in the north, where the power of the Delhi Sultānate had been already considerably weakened, by keeping them constantly engaged in the south. In short, "it was Vijayanagar which held the key to the political situation of the time", characterised by the decline of the Turko-Afghān Sultānate and the rise of important indigenous powers.

The first dynasty of Vijayanagar is named after Sangama. In the time of Harihara I and Bukka I, the Vijayanagar kingdom brought under its influence many principalities and divisions, including, in the opinion of some, most of the Hoysala territory. But it has been pointed out by some writers that Harihara I and Bukka I did not assume full imperial titles. In 1374 Bukka I sent an embassy to China and he died in A.D. 1378–1379. He was succeeded by his son, Harihara II, who undoubtedly assumed the imperial titles of

Mahārājādhirāja, Rājaparameśvara, etc. Sewell in his earlier work[1] states on the authority of some Muhammadan historians that Harihara's reign was a period of "unbroken peace". But it is proved by certain inscriptions that there were conflicts between the Vijayanagar Empire and the Muslims during his reign. As a matter of fact, the history of the Vijayanagar Empire, like that of the Bahmanī kingdom, is an unbroken record of bloody wars with different powers. In the cold weather of 1398, Bukka II, son of Harihara II, conducted a raid northwards to the Bahmanī territory, with his father's permission, with a view to seizing the Rāichūr Doāb, situated between the Kṛishṇā and the Tuṅgabhadrā, which formed the bone of contention between the Vijayanagar Empire and the Bahmanī kingdom. He was opposed and defeated by Fīrūz Shāh Bahmanī and a peace was concluded by the middle of 1399, Fīrūz exacting a heavy indemnity. But as several inscriptions show, the reign of Harihara II saw the extension of Vijayanagar authority over the whole of Southern India, including Mysore, Kanara, Chingleput Trichinopoly and Conjeeveram (Kāñchī). Harihara II was a worshipper of Śiva under the form of Virupākṣa, but was tolerant of other religions. He died in August, 1406, after which the succession to the throne was disputed for some time among his sons. Deva Rāya I, however, secured the throne for himself on the 5th November, 1406. He met with some reverses in his wars with the Bahmanī Sultāns and died in the year A.D. 1422. His son, Vijaya-Bukka or Vīra Vijaya, reigned for only a few months, then Deva Rāya II, son of Vijaya-Bukka, ascended the throne. Though Deva Rāya II's wars with the Bahmanīs ended in defeat and loss, his reign was marked by reorganisation of the administration. To compete with the Bahmanīs, Mussalmāns were admitted by him into the army; and, to control and regulate trade, he appointed his right-hand man, Lakkanna or Lakshmaṇa, to the "lordship of the southern sea", that is, to the charge of overseas commerce. Nicolo Conti, an Italian traveller, and 'Abdur-Razzāq, an envoy from Persia, visited Vijayanagar in 1420 and 1443 respectively; and they have left glowing descriptions of the city and the Empire of Vijayanagar. In fact, the Empire now extended over the whole of South India, reaching the shores of Ceylon, and attained the zenith of its prosperity during the rule of the first dynasty.

Deva Rāya II died in A.D. 1446 and was succeeded by his eldest surviving son, Mallikārjuna, who repelled a combined attack on his capital by the Bahmanī Sultan and the Rājā of the Hindu kingdom of Orissa and was able to keep his kingdom intact during

[1] *A Forgotten Empire*, p. 51.

his rule, which lasted till about A.D. 1465. It was during this reign that the Sāluva chief, Narasimha of Chandragiri, whose ancestors had served the Vijayanagar kingdom faithfully as its feudatories, rose into prominence and resisted the aggressions of the Bahmanī kingdom and the kingdom of Orissa. But Mallikārjuna's successor, Virūpāksha II, proved to be an incompetent ruler. Confusion and disorder naturally followed, taking advantage of which some of the provinces revolted, the Bahmanī Sultān advanced into the Doāb between the Kṛishṇā and the Tungabhadrā, and Rājā Purusottama Gajapati of Orissa advanced as far south as Tiruvannāmalai.

To save the kingdom from these dangers, Narasimha Sāluva deposed his worthless master and seized the throne for himself in about A.D. 1486. Thus the Sangama dynasty was overthrown by what has been called the "First Usurpation" and Vijayanagar passed under the rule of the Sāluva dynasty. Narasimha Sāluva enjoyed the confidence of the people. With the interests of the Empire at heart, he recovered most of the revolted provinces during his six years' rule, though the Rāichūr Doāb remained under the control of the Bahmanīs and Udayagiri under that of the Rājā of Orissa.

Narasimha Sāluva had the prudence to charge his trusted general, Narasa Nāyaka, who claimed descent from a dynasty which ruled over the Tuluva country, with the responsibility for the administration of the kingdom after him, though he desired that his sons should succeed him. Epigraphic evidence disproves the statement of the Muhammadan historians, and of Nuniz, that Narasa Nāyaka murdered the two sons of his master and usurped the throne for himself. In reality he remained loyal to the dynasty of his master. He placed the latter's younger son, Immadi Narasimha, on the throne, when the elder died of wounds in a battle, though he ably managed the affairs of the State as its *de facto* ruler. It was only when he himself died in A.D. 1505 that his son, Vīra Narasimha, deposed the last Sāluva ruler and seized the throne for himself. This "Second Usurpation" led to the direct rule of the Tuluva dynasty over the Vijayanagar Empire. Vīra Narasimha is described on some copper plates and also by Nuniz as a pious king who distributed gifts at sacred places.

Vīra Narasimha was succeeded by his younger brother, Kṛishṇadeva Rāya, by far the greatest ruler of Vijayanagar, and one of the most famous kings in the history of India. A gallant and active warrior, he was always successful in the wars that he waged almost throughout his reign. He first turned his attention towards

suppressing the feudatories in the central portion of his empire before trying to meet his great rivals in the north. Leaving his headquarters towards the end of 1510, he marched against the refractory chief of Ummattūr in Southern Mysore. He was defeated and the fortress of Sivasamudram was captured (1511–1512). Other neighbouring chiefs were also reduced to obedience. In 1512 Kṛishṇadeva Rāya moved towards the Bijāpur frontier and took possession of Rāichūr. Under the advice of his able and experienced minister and general, Sāluva Timma, he did not now invade the Muhammadan territories but turned against Gajapati Pratāparudra of Orissa in 1513, with a view to recovering the territories that his predecessors had captured from Vijayanagar during the reigns of the last rulers of the first dynasty. Early in 1514 he captured the fortress of Udayagiri and made prisoners of an uncle and an aunt of the Rājā of Orissa, who were, however, treated with honour. By the first half of the next year he had captured the strong fortress of Ḳondavīdu and other fortresses of lesser importance in the neighbourhood, in spite of the fact that the Rājā of Orissa had received assistance from the Sultāns of Golkundā and Bīdar. He also took as captives the Gajapati prince, Vīrabhadra, and some other Orissa nobles. The prince was appointed by him governor of a province, and this fact, remarks Krishna Shastri, "testifies to the high statesmanship of Krishnarāya". In his third campaign against the King of Orissa, Kṛishṇadeva Rāya encamped at Bezwāda, laid siege to Kondapalli and captured it. The wife and a son (other than Prince Vīrabhadra) of the Rājā of Orissa and some Orissa nobles and generals fell into his hands on this occasion also. He then advanced north-eastwards as far as Simhāchalam in the Vizagapatam district and forced his Orissan contemporary to come to terms. The last great military achievement of Kṛishnadeva Rāya was his victory over Ismā'īl 'Ādil Shāh near Ṛāichūr on the 19th March, 1520, when the latter attempted to recover the Rāichūr Doāb. He is said to have overrun the Bijāpur territory and to have razed to the ground the fortress of Gulbarga. In short, the military conquests of Kṛishṇadeva Rāya enabled him to humble the pride of his northern foes and to extend the limits of his Empire up to the South Konkan in the west, Vizagapatam in the east and the extreme border of the peninsula in the south, while some islands and coasts of the Indian Ocean were within its sphere of influence. During the last few years of his life he devoted his attention to the organisation of the Empire in all respects and to works of peaceful administration.

Kṛishṇadeva Rāya maintained friendly relations with the Portu-

guese and granted them some concessions, since, writes Sewell, "he benefited largely by the import of horses and other requisites". In 1510 the Portuguese governor, Albuquerque, solicited his permission to build a fort at Bhatkal, which was granted after the Portuguese had captured Goa from the Muslims. The Portuguese traveller, Paes, praises him in eloquent terms: "He is the most learned and perfect king that could possibly be, cheerful of disposition and very merry; he is one that seeks to honour foreigners and receives them kindly; asking all about their affairs whatever their condition may be. He is a great ruler and a man of much justice, but subject to certain fits of rage . . . he is by rank a greater lord than any, by reason of what he possesses in armies and territories, but it seems that he has in fact nothing compared to what a man like him ought to have, so gallant and perfect is he in all things."

The reign of Kṛishṇadeva Rāya not only marked the climax in the territorial expansion of the Vijayanagar Empire, but was also remarkable for the encouragement and development of art and letters. Himself an accomplished scholar, the Rāya was a generous patron of learning. He was "in no way less famous", writes Krishna Shastri, "for his religious zeal and catholicity. He respected all sects of the Hindu religion alike, though his personal leanings were in favour of Vaishṇavism. . . . Krishnarāya's kindness to the fallen enemy, his acts of mercy and charity towards the residents of captured cities, his great military prowess which endeared him alike to his feudatory chiefs and to his subjects, the royal reception and kindness that he invariably bestowed upon foreign embassies, his imposing personal appearance, his genial look and polite conversation which distinguished a pure and dignified life, his love for literature and for religion, and his solicitude for the welfare of his people, and above all, the most fabulous wealth that he conferred as endowments on temples and Brāhmaṇas, mark him out indeed as the greatest of the South Indian monarchs who sheds a lustre on the pages of history." In fact, the Vijayanagar Empire rose, during his reign, to the zenith of its glory and prosperity, when the old Turko-Afghān Sultānate was almost a shrivelled and attenuated carcase and was soon to be swept away by a fresh Turkish invasion.

But dangers lurked for the Vijayanagar Empire in the ambition of her powerful neighbours in the north and in the attitude of her viceroys, two of whom, the viceroy of Madura and the viceroy who was in charge of the central block of the kingdom, rebelled even during the last days (1528 or 1529) of Kṛishṇadeva Rāya.

The former was brought back to submission before the death of Kṛishṇadeva Rāya, but the latter had to be "dealt with only at the beginning of his successor's reign".

Kṛishṇadeva Rāya died in A.D. 1529 or 1530 and was succeeded by his half-brother, Achyuta Rāya, who, as epigraphic and literary evidences show, was not "altogether the craven that he is represented by Nuniz to have been". He chastised the rebel viceroy of Madura and reduced to obedience the Rājā of Travancore, who had given shelter to the former. But he soon committed the blunder of relaxing his personal hold on the administration, which fell under the control of his two brothers-in-law, both named Tirumala. This irritated the other viceroys, who formed a rival party under the leadership of three brothers, Rāma, Tirumala and Venkata, of the Āravīḍu dynasty, connected by marriage with the reigning Tuluva dynasty. The kingdom was consequently plunged into troubles which continued throughout the whole course of its imperial history and did not cease till it entirely disappeared. After the death of Achyuta Rāya in A.D. 1541 or 1542, his son, Venkatādri or Venkata I, ascended the throne, but his reign did not last for more than six months and the crown then passed to Sadāsiva, a nephew of Achyuta. Sadāsiva Rāya was a mere puppet in the hands of his minister, Rāma Rāya, of the Āravīḍu dynasty, who was the *de facto* ruler of the State. Rāma Rāya was endowed with ability and was determined to restore the power of the Vijayanagar Empire, which had sunk low after the death of Kṛishṇadeva Rāya. One important feature of Rāma Rāya's policy was his active interference in the quarrels among the Deccan Sultānates, in alliance first with one and then with another. His enterprises were, indeed, successful for the time being. But these made him over-confident and haughty and ultimately proved to be a cause of disaster for the Empire. In 1543 Rāma Rāya formed an alliance with Ahmadnagar and Golkundā with a view to attacking Bijāpur. But his object was baffled by the diplomacy of the Bijāpur minister, Asad Khān, who concluded peace separately with Burhān Nizām Shāh and Rāma Rāya, and thus broke up the coalition. A change of alliance took place in 1558, when Bijāpur, Golkundā and Vijayanagar joined against Ahmadnagar and invaded it. On this occasion the army of Vijayanagar alienated the people of Ahmadnagar.

The haughty conduct of the Vijayanagar army kindled the long-standing, though smouldering, hostility of the Sultānates of the Deccan against Vijayanagar, and all, with the exception of that of Berar, joined in a coalition against it, which was cemented

by matrimonial alliances. The allied Deccan Sultāns fought against Vijayanagar on the 23rd January, 1565, at a site marked by the two villages of Rāksas and Tagdi. This battle resulted in the defeat of the huge Vijayanagar army with immense losses. "The victors," writes the author of *Burhān-i-Ma'āsir*, "captured jewels, ornaments, furniture, camels, tents, camp-equipage, drums, standards, maidservants, menservants, and arms and armour of all sorts in such quantity that the whole army was enriched." "The plunder was so great," notes Ferishta, "that every private man in the allied army became rich in gold, jewels, tents, arms, horses and slaves, the kings permitting every person to retain what he acquired, reserving the elephants only for their own use." Husain Nizām Shāh killed Rāma Rāya with his own hand and exclaimed: "Now I am avenged of thee! Let God do what He will to me." The magnificent city of Vijayanagar was sacked and deprived of its splendour by the invading army in a manner which has been described by Sewell as follows: "The third day saw the beginning of the end. The victorious Mussalmāns had halted on the field of battle for rest and refreshment, but now they had reached the capital, and from that time forward for a space of five months Vijayanagar knew no rest. The enemy had come to destroy and they carried out their object relentlessly. . . . Nothing seemed to escape them. They broke up the pavilions standing on the huge platform from which the kings used to watch the festivals, and overthrew all the carved work. They lit huge fires in the magnificently decorated buildings forming the temple of Viṭṭhalasvāmī near the river, and smashed its exquisite stone sculptures. With fire and sword, with crowbars and axes, they carried on day after day their work of destruction. Never perhaps in the history of the world has such havoc been wrought, and wrought so suddenly, on so splendid a city; teeming with a wealthy and industrious population in the full plenitude of prosperity one day, and on the next seized, pillaged, and reduced to ruins, amid scenes of savage massacre and horrors beggaring description."

The so-called battle of Talikota is indeed one of the decisive battles in the history of India. It destroyed the chance of Hindu supremacy in the south, which was left open to the invasions of the rulers of a new Turkish dynasty, till the rise of the Marātha power in the seventeenth century. Undoubtedly the battle did vital damage to the Vijayanagar Empire, but recent researches have proved that it did not disappear altogether as a result of it. "Talikota," remarks a modern writer aptly, "was the climacteric,

but not the grand climacteric of the Vijayanagar Empire." In fact, the Empire continued to exist till the early part of the seventeenth century under the rulers of the Āravīḍu dynasty, "before it got weakened and dismembered—weakened by the constant invasions from the north and dismembered by the dissatisfaction and rebellion of the viceroys within".

The victorious Sultānates did not ultimately gain much as a result of this battle. Their alliance was soon dissolved and there was a recrudescence of mutual jealousy. This afforded the Vijayanagar Empire the opportunity for recuperation under Rāma Rāya's brother, Tirumala. He returned to Vijayanagar after the Muslims had left it, but after a short stay there went to Penugondā, and restored the prestige and power of the Empire to such an extent as to be able to interfere in the affairs of the Muslim kingdoms. Towards the end of his reign, in about A.D. 1570, he dispensed with the phantom of the nominal ruler, Sadāsiva, and usurped the throne for the Āravīdu dynasty to which he belonged. His son and successor, Ranga II, continued after him his policy of increasing the efficiency of the Empire. Ranga II was succeeded about A.D. 1586 by his brother, Venkata II, who had his headquarters at Chandragiri and died after a glorious reign in A.D. 1614. He may be regarded as the last great ruler of Vijayanagar, who kept the Empire intact with the exception that in A.D. 1612 Rājā Oedyar founded, with his permission, the kingdom of Mysore, on the extinction of the viceroyalty of Srirangapatan. His death was the signal for the dismemberment of the Empire. It was followed by a war of succession, and the consequent rise of disintegrating forces. These could not be checked by Ranga III, the last important ruler of Vijayanagar, in spite of his best attempts, owing to the selfish attitude of the rebel vassals of the Empire and the ambition of the Muslim States of Bijāpur and Golkundā. Thus the Hindu feudatories of the Vijayanagar Empire proved to be her enemies in the long run. Their "insane pride, blind selfishness, disloyalty and mutual dissensions" largely facilitated the conquest of the Hindu Deccan by the Muslim States of Bijāpur and Golkundā. Further, subordinate viceroys, like the Chiefs of Seringapatam and Beḍnūr (Keḷadi, Ikkeri), and the Nāiks of Madura and Tanjore, carved out independent kingdoms for themselves.

B. Splendour and Wealth of Vijayanagar

Foreign travellers who visited India during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries have left glowing accounts of the Empire of

Vijayanagar. The city of Vijayanagar was encompassed by massive fortifications and was of enormous size. The Italian traveller, Nicolo Conti, who visited it about A.D. 1420 writes: "The circumference of the city is sixty miles; its walls are carried up to the mountains and enclose the valleys at their foot, so that its extent is thereby increased. In this city there are estimated to be ninety thousand men fit to bear arms. . . . The King is more powerful than all the other kings of India." 'Abdur Razzāq, who came to India from Persia and went to Vijayanagar in A.D. 1442–1443, observes: "The country is so well populated that it is impossible in a reasonable space to convey an idea of it. In the King's treasury there are chambers with excavations in them, filled with molten gold, forming one mass. All the inhabitants of the country, whether high or low, even down to the artificers of the bazar, wear jewels and gilt ornaments in their ears and around their necks, arms, wrists and fingers." Domingos Paes, a Portuguese, who has recorded a detailed description of Vijayanagar, writes: "Its King has much treasure and many soldiers and many elephants, for there are numbers of these in this country. . . . In this city you will find men belonging to every nation and people, because of the great trade which it has and the many precious stones there, principally diamonds. . . . This is the best provided city in the world, and is stocked with provisions such as rice, wheat, grains, Indian corn. and a certain amount of barley and beans, moong, pulses, horse-grain and many other seeds which grow in this country, which are the food of the people, and there is a large store of these and very cheap. . . . The streets and markets are full of laden oxen without count. . . ." Edoardo Barbosa, who was present in India in A.D. 1516, describes Vijayanagar as "of great extent, highly populous and the seat of an active commerce in country diamonds, rubies from Pegu, silks of China and Alexandria, and cinnabar, camphor, musk, pepper and sandal from Malabar".

C. Economic Condition of the Vijayanagar Empire

It is clear from foreign accounts, and also other sources, that unbounded prosperity prevailed in the Vijayanagar Empire. Agriculture flourished in different parts of the realm and the State pursued a wise irrigation policy. The principal industries related to textiles, mining and metallurgy, and the most important of the minor industries was perfumery. Craftsmen's and merchants' guilds played an important part in the economic life of the kingdom. 'Abdur Razzāq writes: "The tradesmen of each separate guild or craft

have their shops close to one another." Paes also observes: "There were temples in every street, for these appertain to institutions like the confraternities you know of in our parts, of all the craftsmen and merchants."

The most remarkable feature in the economic condition of the kingdom was commerce, inland, coasting and overseas. The most important port on the Malabar coast was Calicut, and, according to 'Abdur Razzāq, the Empire "possessed 300 seaports". It had commercial relations with the islands in the Indian Ocean, the Malay Archipelago, Burma, China, Arabia, Persia, South Africa, Abyssinia and Portugal. The principal articles of export were cloth, rice, iron, saltpetre, sugar and spices, and the imports into the Empire were horses, elephants, pearls, copper, coral, mercury, China silks and velvet. The cheap means of transport for inland trade were *kāvadis*, head-loads, pack-horses, pack-bullocks, carts and asses. Ships were in use for coasting and overseas trade. According to Barbosa, South India got its ships built in the Maldive Islands. Epigraphic evidence proves that the rulers of Vijayanagar maintained fleets and the people there were acquainted with the art of ship-building before the advent of the Portuguese. We have, however, no definite knowledge as to how the Vijayanagar Empire "dealt with the important question of ocean transport".

The coinage of the Vijayanagar Empire was of various types, both in gold and copper, and there was one specimen of a silver coin. The coins bore on them emblems of different gods and animals varying according to the religious faith of the rulers. The prices of articles were low. The accounts of the foreign travellers tell us that the upper classes of the people had a high standard of living; but we know from inscriptions that the common people groaned under the weight of heavy taxation, collected with rigour by the local governors, who were, however, sometimes restrained by the supreme rulers.

D. Social Life in the Vijayanagar Empire

Accounts of foreign travellers, inscriptions, and literature, contain copious references regarding the different aspects of the social life of the people in the Vijayanagar Empire, of which we can study here only the more striking ones. Women in general occupied a high position in society, and instances of the active part they took in the political, social and literary life of the country are not rare. Besides being trained in wrestling, handling swords and shields, music and other fine arts, some of them at any rate

received a fair amount of literary education. Nuniz writes: "He (the King of Vijayanagar) has also women who wrestle, and others who are astrologers and soothsayers; and he has women who write all the accounts of expenses that are incurred inside the gates, and others whose duty it is to write all the affairs of the kingdom and compare their books with those of the writers outside; he has women also for music, who play instruments and sing. Even the wives of the King are well-versed in music. . . . It is said that he has judges, as well as bailiffs and watchmen who every night guard the palace, and these are women." Plurality of wives was a recognised practice, especially among the wealthy classes, and child marriage was the usual custom. The evil practice of exacting exorbitant dowries was greatly prevalent among those who were well placed in life. The State occasionally interfered in social affairs to settle disputes among various communities. The rite of *Satī*, or women burning themselves on the funeral pyres of their husbands, was very common in Vijayanagar, and the Brāhmaṇas freely sanctioned it. Being held in high esteem by the rulers, the Brāhmaṇas exercised a predominant influence not merely in social and religious matters but also in the political affairs of the State. Nuniz describes them as "honest men, given to merchandise, very acute and of much talent, very good at accounts, lean men and well formed, but little fit for hard work".

There were no strict restrictions in matters of diet. Besides fruits, vegetables and oil, meat of all kinds, excepting that of oxen or cows, for which the people had great veneration, was taken by the general population; but the Brāhmaṇas never killed or ate any "live thing". Nuniz gives the following description about the diet of the Vijayanagar Kings:

"These Kings of Bisnaga eat all sorts of things, but not the flesh of oxen or cows, which they never kill because they worship them. They eat mutton, pork, venison, partridges, hares, doves, quail, and all kinds of birds; even sparrows and rats, and cats, and lizards, all of which are sold in the market of the city of Bisnaga.

"Everything has to be sold alive so that each may know what he buys—this at least so far as concerns game—and there are fish from the rivers in large quantities."

If the statements of Paes and Nuniz be true, this was, remarks Dr. Smith, "a curious dietary for princes and people, who in the time of Krishnadeva Rāya and Achyuta Rāya were zealous Hindus with a special devotion to certain forms of Vishnu". Most probably rats, cats and lizards were eaten by the lower section of the people, who formed the non-Aryan element in the Vijayanagar population.

The foreign travellers refer to numerous blood sacrifices in the kingdom. According to Paes, the King used to witness the sacrifice of 24 buffaloes and 150 sheep, the animals being decapitated by a single blow of a large sickle. On the last day of the famous "nine days festival" 250 buffaloes and 4,500 sheep were slaughtered.

E. Art and Literature

The Vijayanagar Empire has to its credit brilliant cultural and artistic achievements. The Emperors were patrons of all languages—Sanskrit, Telugu, Tamil and Kannaḍa, and under their fostering

VIṬṬHALASVĀMĪ TEMPLE, VIJAYANAGAR

care some of the finest pieces of literature were produced. Sāyaṇa, the famous commentator of the Vedas, and his brother, Mādhava, flourished during the early days of Vijayanagar rule and were deeply attached to the State. The reign of Kṛishṇadeva Rāya was of special importance in this branch of activity as in all others. It marked "the dawn of a new era in the literary history of South India. Himself a scholar, a musician and poet, he loved to gather around him poets, philosophers, and religious teachers whom he honoured with munificent gifts of land and money". He wrote his *magnum opus*, *Āmuktamālyadā*, in Telugu, in the introduction

to which he refers to five Sanskrit works written by him. This book is not merely of religious interest but also of great historical importance for the reign of Kṛishṇadeva Rāya. In his court "flourished the '*Aṣṭadiggajas*', 'the eight elephants' (famous poets), who supported the world of (Telugu) literature". His poet laureate, Peddana, enjoyed a wide reputation and held a high position among Telugu writers. Even the rulers of the Āravīḍu dynasty patronised poets and religious teachers, and Telugu literature flourished under them with "reinforced vigour". There were also authors among the petty chiefs and relatives of the emperors. Works on music, dancing, drama, grammar, logic, philosophy, etc., received encouragement from the emperors and their ministers. In short, the Vijayanagar Empire was a "synthesis of South Indian culture".

Along with the growth of culture we have a remarkable development of art and architecture. The ruins of the old capital of this Empire proclaim to the world that there evolved, in the days of its glory, a distinct style of architecture, sculpture and painting by native artists. The famous Hazāra temple, built during the reign of Kṛishṇadeva Rāya, is, remarks Longhurst, "one of the most perfect specimens of Hindu temple architecture in existence". The Viṭṭhalasvāmī temple is also a fine example of Vijayanagar style. In the opinion of Fergusson, it "shows the extreme limit in florid magnificence to which the style advanced". The art of painting attained a high degree of excellence, and the art of music rapidly developed. Some new works on the subject of music were produced. Kṛishṇadeva Rāya and the Regent, Rāma Rāya, were proficient in music. Theatres provided amusement for the people of the kingdom.

Epigraphic and literary evidence clearly shows that the rulers of Vijayanagar were of pious disposition and devoted to Dharma. But they were not fanatics. Their attitude towards the prevailing four sects, Saiva, Bauddha, Vaishṇava and Jaina, and even alien creeds, Christian, Jewish and Moorish, was liberal. Barbosa writes: "The King allows such freedom that every man may come and go and live according to his own creed without suffering any annoyance, and without enquiry, whether he is a Christian, Jew, Moor or Hindu."

F. Administration of the Vijayanagar Empire

The Vijayanagar Empire gradually developed a centralised administration with all its branches carefully organised. No doubt,

for the task which they set before themselves, its rulers had to maintain a strong army and also to undertake military expeditions, but it does not seem to be correct to describe their State as an essentially military one based on force and condemn it as an organisation which "contained no principle of development; . . . represented no ideal of human progress and therefore could not be lasting", as a modern writer has done. As a matter of fact, with the expansion of the Empire, its rulers organised the administration with such efficiency as served to remove the disorders that had prevailed during the periods of war and facilitate the pursuit of peaceful activities in various fields.

As in other medieval governments, the King was the fountain-head of all power in the Vijayanagar State. He was the supreme authority in civil, military as well as judicial affairs, and also often intervened to settle social disputes. But he was not an irresponsible despot, neglecting the interests of the kingdom and ignoring the rights and wishes of the people. The Vijayanagar kings knew how to secure the good-will of the people; and by their liberal policy they "conduced towards bringing peace and plenty into the kingdom". "A crowned King," writes Krishnadeva Rāya in his *Āmuktamālyadā*, "should always rule with an eye towards *Dharma*." He further says that "a King should rule collecting round him people skilled in statecraft, should investigate the mines yielding precious metals in his kingdom and extract the same, should levy taxes from his people moderately, should counteract the acts of his enemies by crushing them with force, should be friendly, should protect one and all of his subjects, should put an end to the mixing up of the castes among them, should always try to increase the merit of the Brāhmaṇas, should strengthen his fortress and lessen the growth of the undesirable things and should be ever mindful of the purification of his cities. . . ."

The King was assisted in the task of administration by a council of ministers, appointed by him. Though the Brāhmaṇas held high offices in the administration and had considerable influence, the ministers were recruited not only from their ranks but also from those of the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas. The office of a minister was "sometimes hereditary and sometimes rested on selection". Both 'Abdur Razzāq and Nuniz refer to the existence of a sort of secretariat. Besides the ministers, the other officers of the State were the chief treasurer; the custodians of the jewels; an officer who was to look after the commercial interests of the State; the prefect of the police, who was responsible for the prevention

of crime and maintenance of order in the city; the chief master of the horse; and subordinate officials like the *bhāṭs*, who sang the praise of the kings, the *betel*-bearers or personal attendants of the King, the calendar-makers, the engravers and the composer of inscriptions.

A magnificent court was maintained by the kings of Vijayanagar in the capital city at a huge cost of money. It was attended by nobles, priests, litterateurs, astrologers and musicians, and festivals were celebrated with great pomp and grandeur.

The Empire was divided for administrative purposes into several provinces (*rājya*, *maṇḍala*, *chāvaḍi*), which had again subdivisions like *veṇṭhe*,[1] *nāḍu*,[2] *sīma*, village and *sthala*[3] in the Karnātaka portion, and *koṭṭam*,[4] *parru*, *nāḍu* and village in the Tamil portion. It is very difficult to state the exact number of provinces in the Empire. Some writers relying on Paes write that the Empire was divided into 200 provinces. But the foreign traveller evidently "confounds the tributary kings with the provincial viceroys, and these again with the minor nobles who were merely officials in the government". According to H. Krishna Shastri, the Empire was divided into six principal provinces. Each province was under a viceroy, *nāyaka* or *nāik*,[5] who might be a member of the royal house, or an influential noble of the State, or some descendant of the old ruling families. Each viceroy exercised civil, military and judicial powers within his jurisdiction, but he was required to submit regular accounts of the income and expenditure of his charge to the central government and render it military aid in times of need. Further, he was liable to severe punishment by the King if he proved to be a traitor or oppressed the people, and his estate could be confiscated to the State if he made default in sending one-third of his income to the latter. Though the *nāiks* were generally severe in raising revenue from the people, they were not unmindful of beneficial work like the encouragement of agriculture, the plantation of new villages, protection of religion and erection of temples and other buildings. But they were greatly responsible for the disorders which prevailed in Southern India during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when the power of Vijayanagar disappeared for ever.

[1] A territorial division higher than a *nāḍu*.
[2] A territorial division higher than a village.
[3] A portion of land comprising several fields.
[4] A territorial division higher than a *parru*, which again was higher than a *nāḍu*.
[5] The designation of Nāik was also given to the collectors of customs and military commanders.

The Vijayanagar rulers inherited and continued to maintain a healthy and vigorous system of local administration, with the village as the lowest unit. Each village was a self-sufficient unit. The village assembly, like the *Panchāyat* of Northern India, conducted the administration of the area under its charge—executive, judicial and police—through its hereditary officers like the *senateova* or the village accountant, the *talara* or the village watchman or commandant, the *begāra* or the superintendent of forced labour, and others. These village officers were paid either by grants of land or a portion of agricultural produce. The heads of commercial groups or corporations seem "to have formed an integral part of the village assemblies". The King maintained a link with the village administration through his officer called the *Mahānāyakāchārya*, who exercised a general supervision over it.

Land revenue, known as *śist*, was the principal source of income of the Vijayanagar State. It had an efficient system of land revenue administration, under a department called the *aṭhavane*. Lands were classified under three heads for the purpose of assessment—wet land, dry land, and orchards and woods; and the assessments to be paid by the tenants were clearly indicated. To meet the heavy burdens of the State, and solve the problem of obtaining men and money to withstand its enemies, the Vijayanagar Emperors gave up the traditional rate of assessment at one-sixth of the produce and increased it to some extent. It is difficult to accept the statement of Nuniz that the "husbandmen had to pay one-tenth of their produce". The Vijayanagar rulers adopted the "principle of differential taxation", that is, levied taxes according to the relative fertility of the lands. Besides the land tax, the *ryots* had to pay other kinds of taxes like grazing tax, marriage tax, etc. Other sources of income of the State were the revenue from customs duties; tolls on roads; revenue from gardening and plantations; and taxes levied on dealers in goods of common consumption, manufacturers and craftsmen, potters, washermen, shoemakers, barbers, mendicants, temples and prostitutes. Taxes were paid both in cash and kind, as during the days of the Cholas.

There is no doubt that the incidence of taxation was heavy and the provincial governors and revenue officials often practised oppression on the people. But at the same time there are instances to show that the Government redressed the grievances of the people on complaints being made to it and sometimes reduced or remitted taxes, and that the people could appeal directly to the King in time of need. The Empire could certainly not last for about three centuries on a systematic policy of extortion and oppression.

The King was the supreme judge, but there were regular courts and special judicial officers for the administration of justice. Sometimes, disputes were settled by the State officials with the co-operation of the local bodies. The only law of the land was not "the law of the Brāhmaṇas which is that of the priests", as Nuniz would ask us to believe, but was based on traditional regulations and customs, strengthened by the constitutional usage of the country, and its observance was strictly enforced. Severe punishment was inflicted on guilty persons. These penalties were chiefly of four kinds—fines, confiscation of property, ordeals and death. Death or mutilation was the punishment for crimes like theft, adultery and treason. Sometimes the criminals were "cast down before the feet of an elephant, that they may be killed by its knees, trunk and tusks". Official oppression in the sphere of justice was not absent, but the State occasionally granted remedies against it, and it was also "sometimes successfully checked by the united opposition of corporate bodies".

Like the Hoysalas, the rulers of Vijayanagar had a carefully organised military department, called *Kandāchāra*, under the control of the *Dandanāyaka* or *Dannāyaka* (Commander-in-Chief), who was assisted by a staff of minor officials. The State maintained a large and efficient army, the numerical strength of which was not, however, uniform all through. The regular troops of the King were, in times of need, reinforced by auxiliary forces of the feudatories and nobles. The several component parts of the army were the infantry, recruited from people of different classes and creeds, occasionally including even Muslims; the cavalry, strengthened by the recruitment of good horses from Ormuz through the Portuguese, owing to a dearth of these animals in the Empire; elephants; camels; and artillery, the use of which by the Hindus as early as A.D. 1368 is proved by the evidence of foreign accounts as well as of inscriptions. The discipline and fighting strength of the Vijayanagar army were, however, inferior to those of the armies of the Muslim States of the Deccan.

With all that has been said above, the Vijayanagar Empire suffered from certain defects. Firstly, the provincial governors enjoyed a good deal of independence, which contributed in no small degree to the weakening of the central authority and ultimately to the disintegration of the Empire. Secondly, the Empire failed to develop a sustained commercial activity in spite of various facilities. "This failure," remarks Dr. Aiyangar justly, "proved a vital defect in the imperial career of Vijayanagar, and made a permanent Hindu Empire impossible." Thirdly, in

consideration of temporary gains, the Emperors allowed the Portuguese to settle on the west coast and thus "principles of profit" overrode "the greater question of the stability of their Empire".

The Kingdom of Orissa

Orissa was consolidated into a powerful kingdom by Anantavarman Choḍa Ganga during his long reign of more than seventy years (c. 1076–1148). It appears from several inscriptions that the kingdom then extended from the mouth of the Ganges to the mouth of the Godāvarī in the south. Choḍa Ganga's achievements in the domain of peace were also remarkable. He was a patron of religion, and of Sanskrit as well as Telugu literature. The great temple of Jagannāth at Purī stands as a brilliant monument to "the artistic vigour and prosperity of Orissa during his reign". The successors of Choḍa Ganga effectively checked the invasions of the Muslims and maintained the prosperity of their kingdom. The most famous of them was Narasimha I (1238–1264), who, besides achieving a remarkable success against the Muslims of Bengal, probably completed the construction of the temple of Jagannāth at Purī and built the great temple of the Sun-God at Koṇārak in the Purī district. After the death of Narasimha, the fortunes of the dynasty began to decline, and it was supplanted in about A.D. 1434–1435 by a solar dynasty, which ruled in Orissa for more than a century.

The founder of the new dynasty, Kapilendra, was endowed with considerable ability and vigour, and restored the prestige of the kingdom of Orissa, which had sunk low during the reigns of the later Gangas. He suppressed the powerful rebels in his own country, fought successfully with the Bahmanīs of Bīdar and the rulers of Vijayanagar, succeeded in extending his dominions from the Ganges to the Kāverī, and even marched with a victorious army to the vicinity of Bīdar in the heart of the Bahmanī kingdom. It is stated in the Gopināthpur inscription that he took possession of Udayagiri, the seat of a Vijayanagar viceroyalty, and Conjeeveram. The beginning of the reign of the next ruler, Purushottama (A.D. 1470–1497), was marked by certain disorders during which the kingdom of Orissa lost its southern half from the Godāvarī downwards. Sāluva Narasimha captured the country to the south of the Kṛishṇā and the Bahmanīs seized the Godāvarī-Kṛishṇā Doāb. But towards the end of his reign Purushottama recovered the Doāb and regained a part of the Andhra country as far as the modern Guntur district. It cannot be said with certainty

BLACK PAGODA, DANCING HALL, KONĀRAK



CHARIOT WHEEL, KONĀRAK

if he recovered any of the Tamil districts of the empire of Kapilendra.

Purushottama's son and successor, Pratāparudra (1497–1540), a contemporary and disciple of Chaitanya, inherited a kingdom extending from the Hugli and Midnāpur districts of Bengal to the Guntur district of Madras, and including also a part of the highlands of Telingāna. But it was not destined to maintain this extent for long owing to the aggressions of Kṛishṇadeva Rāya of Vijayanagar and of the growing Qutb Shāhī kingdom of Golkundā on the eastern coast. As a result of three campaigns, Pratāparudra had to cede to his more powerful Vijayanagar contemporary that portion of his kingdom which lay to the south of the Godāvarī. The Sultān Quli Qutb Shāh of Golkundā invaded the kingdom of Orissa in 1522.

Some believe that this political decline of Orissa was a sequel to the loss of martial spirit by her rulers and people due to the effect of Vaishṇavism preached by Chaitanya. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the kingdom of Orissa lost its old power from the beginning of the sixteenth century. About A.D. 1541–1542 the dynasty of Kapilendra was supplanted by the Bhoi dynasty, which was so called because its founder, Govinda, formerly a minister of Pratāparudra, belonged to the Bhoi or writer caste. Govinda, his son and two grandsons reigned for about eighteen years. The dynasty was ousted, in about A.D. 1559, by Mukunda Harichandana, who did his best to save the kingdom of Orissa from Muslim invasions till his death in A.D. 1568, and whose alliance was sought by Akbar in pursuance of his policy of attacking the Afghāns of Bengal from both sides. The Kararānī Sultāns of Bengal annexed Orissa in A.D. 1568. The Hindu renegade, Kālāpāhār, who had accompanied Sulaimān Kararānī's son, Bāyazīd, to Orissa, is said to have desecrated the temple of Jagannāth and even made attempts to destroy the wooden idols. Then began a Mughul-Afghān contest for the possession of Orissa.

Mewār

Some of the Rājput States were stirred with the spirit of revival on the dismemberment of the Turko-Afghān Empire. The most prominent of these was the Guhila principality of Mewār, where the Rājput genius unfolded itself so brilliantly and which for generations produced a succession of brave generals, heroic leaders, prudent rulers and some brilliant poets. As early as the seventh century A.D. the brave and chivalrous Rājputs of the Guhila clan

established their power in this territory. We have already narrated how 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī besieged and captured Chitor, the capital of Mewār, and how Hamīr, or his son, delivered it from the hands of the Muslims and retrieved the lost honour of his race. Hamīr died full of years possibly in A.D. 1364 "leaving a name still honoured in Mewār as one of the wisest and most gallant of her princes and bequeathing well-established and extensive power" to his son, Kshetra Simha. Kshetra Simha being killed in the course of a family

CHITORGARH

(Affording a view of the Kīrtistambha at the upper right corner)

quarrel in or about A.D. 1382 was succeeded by his son, Lākhā. On Lākhā's death after 1418 (?), his son, Mokala, ascended the throne of Mewār, but he was assassinated in or about A.D. 1431 by two of his uncles. The next Rānā of Mewār was Kumbha, one of the most famous rulers in the history of India. His reign was an important period in the annals of his country. Tod thus praises his achievements: "All that was wanting to augment her (Mewār's) resources against the storms which were collecting on the brows of Caucasus and the shores of Oxus, and were destined to burst on the head of his grandson, Sangha, was effected by Kumbha; who with Hamīr's energy, Lākhā's taste for arts, and a genius compre-

hensive as either or more fortunate, succeeded in all his undertakings, and once more raised the 'crimson banner' of Mewār upon the banks of the Ghaggar, the scene of Samarsi's defeat." Kumbha fought against the Muslim rulers of Mālwa and Gujarāt, and although success did not attend all his enterprises, he could hold his own position against his ambitious neighbours. He was also a mighty builder, to whom Mewār is indebted for some of her finest monuments. Of the eighty-four fortresses built for the defence of Mewār, thirty-two were erected by Kumbha. The most brilliant monument of his military and constructive genius is the fortress of *Kumbhalgarh*, "second to none in strategical importance or historical renown". Kumbha's *Jayastambha*, also called the *Kīrtistambha* (Tower of Fame), is another monument of his genius. Further, the Rānā was a poet, a man of letters and an accomplished musician. He was assassinated by his son, Udaya Karan, probably in A.D. 1469. This cruelty of Udaya's horrified the nobles, who acknowledged his younger brother, Rāyamalla, as the Rānā. Rāyamalla's sons quarrelled among themselves for the succession and ultimately one of them, Sangrāma, or Sanga, as he was popularly called, succeeded to the throne of Mewār in or about A.D. 1509. Sanga was endowed with remarkable military prowess. A hero of a hundred fields, he bore the scars of eighty wounds on his body in addition to having an eye blinded and a leg crippled. He fought successfully against Mālwa, Delhi and Gujarāt, and organised the financial resources and the military forces of Mewār with a view to building her supremacy on the break-up of the Delhi Sultānate. Thus a contest between him and any other power then trying to establish supremacy in Northern India was inevitable. The battle of Khānua, to be described in a subsequent chapter, was a logical outcome of this fact.

Kāmarūpa and Assam

At the time of the advent of the Muslims in Bengal in the early thirteenth century, the Brahmaputra valley was parcelled out into a number of independent principalities, at war with one another. A line of Chutiya (a tribe of mixed Bodo-Shān stock) kings ruled over the tract east of the Subansiri and the Disang, while a strip to the south and south-east was under the control of some Bodo tribes. Further west was a Kachārī kingdom lying south of the Brahmaputra and extending probably half way across the Nowgong district. West of the Chutiyas on the north bank and of the Kachārīs on the south, were the domains of some petty chiefs called Bhuiyās. To the extreme west was situated the kingdom of Kāmarūpa, the western boundary of which was marked by the

river Karatoyā and the eastern boundary varied according to the position of its hostile neighbours. It was known as the kingdom of Kāmata. The Āhoms, a section of the great Shān tribe, had appeared as a new element in the history of the Brahmaputra valley early in the thirteenth century, and checked the eastern expansion of the Kāmata kingdom, while its western neighbours, the Muslim Sultāns of Bengal, led several invasions into its territories with varying results.

Early in the fifteenth century a strong monarchy was established in Kāmata by the Khens with their capital at Kāmatāpur, a few miles to the south of Cooch Bihār. The Khens ruled over Kāmata for about seventy-five years and their last ruler, Nilāmbar, was overthrown by 'Alā-ud-dīn Husain Shāh in about A.D. 1498. After a short period of confusion, Biswa Simha, of the Koch tribe, which was Mongoloid in origin, established a powerful kingdom with Koch Bihār, modern Cooch Bihār, as his capital, about A.D. 1515. The greatest ruler of this line was Biswa Simha's son and successor, Nara Nārāyan, during whose reign the kingdom of Kāmata grew in prosperity, and reached the zenith of its power. But in 1581 he was compelled to cede the portions of his kingdom to the east of the river Sankosh to his nephew, Raghu Dev. Thus the Koch kingdom was divided into two rival principalities, called Koch Bihār and Koch Hājo by the Muslims. Their feuds drew the intervention of the Āhoms and the Muslims, and in 1639 the western and the eastern States fell under the supremacy of the Muslims and the Āhoms respectively.

The Āhoms, a section of the Shān tribe, who appeared in Assam in about A.D. 1215, gradually consolidated their position and established a strong monarchy which lasted for six centuries. During the period under review they checked the eastward expansion of the kings of Kāmarūpa and the Sultāns of Bengal. The kingdom of the Āhoms became vulnerable to Muslim attacks only after the latter had subjugated Kāmarūpa. Thus 'Alā-u-dīn Husain Shāh of Bengal led an expedition into Assam when it was ruled by Suhenpha. In spite of the initial success of Muslim arms, this expedition had a disastrous end. There was no Āhom-Muslim conflict for more than thirty years, till the second phase of it began when invasions into Assam were conducted by some local Muhammadan chieftains of Bengal. But their attempts also failed by September, 1533. Thus the attempt of the Muslims of Bengal to conquer Assam ended in failure by the thirties of the sixteenth century. The history of Assam after this period will be treated in its proper place.

Nepāl

By the year A.D. 879 Nepāl possibly threw off the Tibetan yoke and came to have an independent history of its own. For two hundred years after this we know little about the kings ruling in Nepāl, but from the eleventh century Nepāl flourished under the Thākurīs. For more than two hundred years (1097–1326), the Karnātaka king Nānyadeva of Mithila and his successors claimed, from their capital at Simrāon, a sort of loose sovereignty over the local princes of Nepāl. In A.D. 1324, Harisimha of Tirhut, a descendant of Nānyadeva, invaded Nepāl, the reigning king of which, Jayarudramalla, submitted to him. With his headquarters at Bhatgāon, Harisimha gradually extended his power over the whole valley, and his kingdom had diplomatic relations with China in the fourteenth century. But at the same time Harisimha and his descendants "left undisturbed the local rulers, who acknowledged their hegemony, in the possession of the two other capitals, viz., Patan and Katmandu". About 1370 A.D. Jaya-Sthitimalla, grandson-in-law of the Malla king, Jayarudra (1320–1326), and son-in-law of Jagatsimha, a prince of the Karnātaka line of Harisimha, who had married Jayarudra's daughter, Nāyakadevī, seized the throne of the Mallas and by 1382 established his authority over practically the whole of Nepāl. It was henceforth ruled by his descendants "in regular succession". He had three sons—Dharmamalla, Jyotirmalla and Kīrtimalla. They kept the kingdom undivided. By A.D. 1418 Harisimha's descendants lost their authority in Nepāl, and Jyotirmalla tried to exercise imperial power. About A.D. 1426 Jyotirmalla was succeeded by his eldest son, Yakshamalla, who ruled for more than half a century and was the greatest of the Malla rulers of Nepāl. But he made a mistake before his death, about 1480, in partitioning the kingdom among his sons and daughters. This led to the rise of the two rival principalities of Katmandu and Bhatgaōn, whose quarrels ultimately led to the conquest of Nepāl by the Gurkhās in A.D. 1768.

CHAPTER VI

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TURKO-AFGHĀNS IN INDIA, AND MORAL AS WELL AS MATERIAL CONDITIONS OF THE COUNTRY DURING THEIR RULE

1. The Turko-Afghān Government

A. The Central Government

THE Muslim State in India was a theocracy, the existence of which was theoretically justified by the needs of religion. The Sultān was considered to be Cæsar and Pope combined in one. In theory, indeed, his authority in religious matters was limited by the Holy Law of the Quran, and with the exception of 'Alā-ud-dīn, no Sultān could clearly divorce religion from politics. But in practice, the Muslim Sultān of India was a perfect autocrat, unchecked by any restrictions; and his word was law. The Sultāns at times paid, with two short breaks, only ceremonial allegiance to the Khalifahs of Baghdād and Egypt, but did not owe their power to them nor to the will of the people, though the Islamic theory of sovereignty was constitutional and democratic in character. In fact, the Muslim State in India was, to all intents and purposes, independent and autonomous, the Sultān being the mainspring of the entire system of administration. The real source of the Sultān's authority was military strength, and this was understood and acquiesced in, not merely by the unthinking rabble but also by the soldiers, the poets (e.g. Amīr Khusrav) and the *Ulemas* of the age. As the supreme head of the executive, the Sultān transacted the affairs of the State with the help of such officers and ministers as he might choose to select. The State being essentially military in character, the Sultān was the chief commander of forces; he was also the chief law-giver and the final court of appeal.

The autocracy of the Muslim Sultāns of India was the inevitable result of the then circumstances. They had to be constantly on their guard against the hostility of the Hindu States, the Hindu fighting communities and the Mongol invaders. This required a strong centralised government, which gradually made itself despotic. Further, there was no hereditary Muslim aristocracy, conscious of

its own rights and privileges and eager to assert these against royal despotism, although occasionally some nobles made their influence felt. There were also no popular assemblies, keen about constitutional liberty, and no strong public opinion, competent enough to oppose autocracy. Even the *Ulemas*, who exercised much influence in the State, had not the courage to openly oppose the Sultāns and depose an undesirable ruler in the same manner as Hildebrand deposed Henry IV. Succession to the Sultānate of Delhi was not determined by any recognised law, nor was there any definite principle. "Broadly speaking, the choice was limited, as a matter of convenience, to the surviving members of the deceased Sultān's family. The priority of birth, the question of efficiency, the nomination of the dead king—these considerations sometimes received some attention, but the decisive voice seems to have been that of the nobles, who usually preferred personal convenience to the interests of the State."

Even the most autocratic ruler cannot manage the task of administration single-handed. Thus the Sultāns of Delhi had to devise, from the beginning of their rule, an administrative machinery with a regular hierarchy of officers in charge of various departments, who, however, did not in any way check their authority but rather carried out their respective duties according to the former's orders. The Sultāns had a council of friends and trusted officers called the *Majlis-i-Khalwat*, which they consulted when important affairs of State demanded attention. The councillors might express their opinions, which at times had some influence on the administration; but these were not binding on the Sultān. The Sultān received all courtiers, *Khāns*, *Maliks*, and *Amīrs*, in a court called *Bār-i-Khās*. He sat as the supreme judge in the *Bār-i-Ām*, where he tried cases, received petitions of the people and heard their complaints. The highest officer in the Central Government was the Wazīr, who had control over the other departments of the State,—such as the *Diwān-i-Risālat* or the Department of Appeals, the *Diwān-i-Arz* or the Military Department, the *Diwān-i-Inshā* or the Correspondence Department, the *Diwān-i-Bandagān* or the Department of Slaves, the *Diwān-i-Qazā-i-Mamālik* or the Department of Justice, Intelligence and Posts, the *Diwān-i-Amīr Kohi* or the Department of Agriculture (created by Muhammad bin Tughluq), the *Diwān-i-Mustakhraj* or the Department to look after and realise arrears from collectors or agents (created by 'Alā-ud-dīn Khalji), *Diwān-i-Khairāt* or the Department of Charity (in Fīrūz Shāh's reign), *Diwān-i-Istihqāq* or the Department of Pensions,—and also over the Mint, the charitable institutions and the *Kārkhānās*. Besides the high officers in charge of the various departments, there were other

subordinate officers like the *Mustaufi-i-Mamālik* or the Auditor General, whose duty was to check the expenditure of the State; the *Mushrif-i-Mamālik*, who was in charge of the accounts of receipts; the *Majmudār*, who preserved the records of loans advanced by government; the *Khāzin* or the Treasurer; the *Amīr-i-Behr* or the Controller of Boats; the *Bakhshi-i-Fauj* or Paymaster of the Forces, and others. The *Nāib-i-Wazīr-i-Mamālik* or the Deputy Wazīr did not enjoy a very high status. The Tughluq period was "the heyday of the Wazīrat in Muslim India", and from the days of the later Tughluqs the powers of the Wazīr grew enormously. But these began to decline in the time of the Sayyids and the office of the Wazīr became obscure under the Afghāns.

Justice was usually administered by the *Qāzī-ul-Qazāt*, or the Lord Chief Justice, who was aided by *Muftīs* to expound the law, which was based on the injunctions of the Quran, though rulers like 'Alā-ud-dīn and Muhammad bin Tughluq were guided by considerations of policy. The penal law was excessively severe, the penalties of mutilation and death being usually inflicted on the culprits. Force and torture were employed to extort confession. The judicial procedure does not seem to have been very regular. Cases were started without due enquiries and, on most occasions, received summary trials. The law of debt, as we know from Marco Polo, was severe; and the creditors often invoked royal assistance to realise their dues from the debtors. The *Kotwāl* was the custodian of peace and order; and another officer of the municipal police was the *Muhtasib*, whose duties were to keep a strict watch over the conduct of the people, to control the markets and to regulate weights and measures. The Sultān kept himself informed of the movements of the people through a large number of spies. The old forts and castles were utilised as prisons. The prison "regulations were lax, and corruption prevailed among the officers".

The fiscal policy of the Turkish Sultāns of India was modelled on the theory of finance of the Hanafī school of Muslim Jurists, which the former borrowed from the Ghaznavids whom they had supplanted. Thus the principal sources of revenue of the Delhi Sultānate were the *Kharāj* or land tax from the Hindu chiefs and landlords; land revenue obtained from the *Khālsā* or crown-lands, *iqtā's* or lands granted to followers and officers (usually military) for certain years or for the lifetime of the grantee, who was known as the *Muqta*, and other classes of lands; *Khams* or one-fifth of the spoils of war; and religious tax. Besides these, *abwābs* or cesses and other kinds of taxes like the house tax, grazing tax, water tax, etc., were levied on the people. The State also derived

some income from trade duties. The *jizya* was originally a sort of tax levied on the non-Muslims "in return for which they received protection of life and property and exemption from military service". But in course of time, a religious motive was attached to it, and in India it was the only extra burden which the Hindus had to bear. Taxes were paid both in cash and kind. We have already given the important points regarding the revenue reforms of the Khaljīs and the Tughluqs. It may be noted here that the revenue policy of the State, and the satisfactory working or otherwise of the revenue department, varied according to the personality of the rulers. While no important changes in revenue administration are recorded to have been effected by Iltutmish, and only a few attempts were made by Balban to make it orderly, 'Alā-ud-dīn's revenue policy was comprehensive, affecting all types of land tenures, and Muhammad bin Tughluq's vigorous but ill-advised revenue policy also deeply influenced the condition of the State. The rate of assessment also varied, being excessively high since the time of 'Alā-ud-dīn, who charged 50 per cent on the gross produce of the land. In spite of his general leniency, Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq does not seem to have reduced the scale as fixed by 'Alā-ud-dīn, and in the time of Muhammad bin Tughluq it was certainly not lower, if not higher, than this. The farming system was prevalent, and its lavish extension in the time of Fīrūz Shāh proved to be detrimental to the integrity of the State.

The standing army of the Sultānate consisted of the royal bodyguard, and the troops of the capital, which were, in times of need, reinforced by the levies sent by the provincial viceroys and the *Muqtas*, and the contingents of Hindu troops. Men of different nationalities, such as Turks, Khataians, Persians and Indians, were enlisted in the army. The main branches of the army were the infantry, including numerous archers, the cavalry, and the elephants. There was nothing like artillery, which came to be used effectively in later times; but rockets and naphtha balls, and a machine discharging balls by the force of gunpowder, were used, though not with much effect, as early as the reign of Iltutmish. Further, a sort of mechanical artillery, consisting of various crude machines, like *manjaniqs*, *mangonels*, *mangons*, through which fire-balls, fire-arrows, pieces of rock, stones, earthen or iron balls, bottles full of naphtha, and scorpions and other poisonous reptiles, could be hurled against the enemy, were used in siege-craft in medieval India.

The Turkish Sultāns of Delhi maintained a court,—though not so splendid as that of the Great Mughuls,—through which their majesty found expression. Harems, full of the wives and concubines of the Sultāns and princes of the royal blood, were kept in

the apartments of the royal palace. Culture of a rather limited type was patronised in these courts, but their maintenance must have caused a heavy drain on the economic resources of the country.

B. Administration of the Provinces

The direct influence of the Sultān was limited to the area within striking distance of his forts and outposts, and the distant provinces were placed in the charge of viceroys, who were called Nāib Sultāns. The number of provinces varied from twenty to twenty-five. A province was subdivided into smaller portions, which were in the charge of *Muqtas* or of *Āmils*; and there were further smaller units under *Shiqdārs*, whose jurisdiction did not extend over more than a few miles. Each province was "a replica of the Empire", and the Nāib Sultān exercised executive, judicial, and military functions in his territory almost as a despot, subject only to the control of the central government, which varied according to the strength or weakness of the latter. Muhammad bin Tughluq's failure to control the provinces encouraged his viceroys to declare independence. The viceroy was paid from the revenue of his province, and after meeting the cost of his administration he had to remit the surplus to the central exchequer. He maintained a local militia and had to render military aid, at times, to the Sultān. Thus his position was somewhat like that of a feudal baron of medieval Europe. The intrigues of the nobles, and lack of co-operation among the officers, usually hampered the good working of the provincial government; and consequently peace and order were not perfectly maintained. Besides the imperial provinces, large tracts of land had of necessity to be left in the hands of old Hindu chieftains, who were not interfered with in ruling their ancestral territories so long as they sent tributes and presents to Delhi. The village communities continued unaffected by the establishment of a new government in the country.

C. The Muslim Nobility

The nobility exercised a predominant influence in the State as generals, administrators and sometimes as king-makers. But it was not a hereditary, homogeneous and well-organised body as was the case with the nobles of France or of England. Though the Turks formed the majority in this class, there were in it also men of other nationalities, like Arabs, Afghāns, Abyssinians, Egyptians, people of Java, and Indians. Such a heterogeneous class could hardly be expected to work with a common aim or principle and offer a healthy check to royal absolutism. Naturally the nobles

often occupied themselves with their mutual rivalries and pursued selfish interests at the cost of the welfare of the State. "The nobility," remarks a modern writer, "was nothing more than a mere agglomeration of disintegrating atoms," which failed to "evolve a workable constitution for the country." The State might have derived some benefit from its aristocracy, but it suffered more from a gross caricature of debased feudalism, which was largely responsible for its dismemberment.

The Turko-Afghān machinery of administration, briefly outlined above, lacked the force of habit, derived from tradition, and of will, derived from national support, both of which are necessary for the security and long tenure of a government. Its military and feudal character, which was the inevitable result of the circumstances under which it grew, was opposed to the traditional ancient government of the land, though the medieval Rājput States might have afforded a parallel to it. By the nature of its growth, it could seldom be established on the goodwill and support of the people. As a matter of fact, a tie of mutual attachment between the rulers and the masses of the people was in many cases absent. The State grew on military strength, its rulers were, in most cases, concerned with measures calculated to strengthen their own authority; and its aristocracy, without any consistent policy, pursued selfish interests. Its collapse was inevitable when the Sultāns failed to command adequate force and the aristocracy grew more ambitious and turbulent.

2. Economic and Social Conditions

A. Economic

It is not easy to form an accurate idea of the economic condition of the vast numbers of the people of India, during the three centuries of Turko-Afghān rule. Some attempts have, however, been made recently to arrive at the facts of the matter by collecting incidental references from chronicles, the works of Amīr Khusrav, folklore and fiction, poetry and ballads, the writings of Hindu as well as Muslim mystics, works on practical arts and treatises on law and ethics, the accounts left by foreign travellers, and some official and private correspondence. The country was then famous for her untold wealth. We know from Ferishta how Mahmūd of Ghaznī carried off a vast booty, and it is striking that even after the thoughtless extravagance of Muhammad bin Tughluq, and the chronic disorders of the later Tughluq period, Tīmūr captured an enormous booty in Delhi. But the State did not pursue any comprehensive economic policy aiming at the improvement of the

condition of the people; and the few experiments of the Khaijīs or the Tughluqs did not produce permanent results. "On the whole," remarks a modern Muslim writer, "any big improvement in the method of production, a more equitable distribution of the economic wealth, or a better adjustment of the economic position of the various social classes, was outside the policy of the State."

India had, however, traditions of industrial organisation, through the guilds and crafts of the village communities and of the urban areas, and of widespread commerce, internal as well as external, which survived the shocks of political revolutions in spite of the absence of State guidance and support during the period under review. The Sultāns of Delhi, or, in later times, some of the minor provincial rulers, encouraged industries and trade only for their own political and administrative needs. Thus the royal *kārkhānās* or manufactories at Delhi sometimes employed 4,000 weavers of silk besides manufacturers of other stuffs to satisfy royal demands. There were no factories or large-scale industrial organisations such as we have to-day. In most cases the manufacturers dealt directly with the traders, though occasionally they disposed of their goods at fairs, and again sometimes a number of them were employed by some enterprising business men to manufacture goods under their supervision. Though agriculture formed the occupation of the bulk of the people, there were some important industries in the urban as well as rural areas of the country. These were the textile industry, including the manufacture of cotton cloth, woollen cloth and silks, the dyeing industry and calico-printing, the sugar industry, metal-work, stone and brick work, and the paper industry. The minor industries were cup-making, shoe-making, making of arms, especially bows and arrows, manufacture of scents, spirits and liquors, etc. Bengal and Gujarāt were especially renowned for the manufacture and export of textile goods. The excellence of Bengal goods has been highly praised by Amīr Khusrav, and foreign travellers, like Mauhan, who visited Bengal in A.D. 1406, Barthema, who came to India during the early part of the sixteenth century (1503–1508), and Barbosa, who came here about A.D. 1518.

The volume of India's internal trade during this period "was large except when thwarted by the monopoly of the State or rigid administrative control". Her commercial relations with the outside world also deserve notice. The sea-route connected her commercially with the distant regions of Europe, the Malay Islands and China, and other countries on the Pacific Ocean; and she had intercourse through land routes with Central Asia, Afghānistān, Persia, Tibet and Bhutān. The author of *Masālik-ul-absār* writes:

"Merchants of all countries never cease to carry pure gold into India, and to bring back in exchange commodities of herbs and gums." The chief imports were articles of luxury for the richer classes and horses and mules; and the principal exports consisted of varieties of agricultural goods, and textile manufactures, the minor ones being tutenag, opium, indigo-cakes, etc. Some countries round the Persian Gulf were entirely dependent on India for their food supply. The ports of Bengal and Gujarāt were then chiefly used for India's export trade. Barthema considered Bengal to be "the richest country in the world for cotton, ginger, sugar, grain and flesh of every kind".

The prices of goods were not uniform throughout the period. These were abnormally high in times of famine and scarcity, but very low in times of overproduction. Thus, owing to severe famines during the reign of Muhammad bin Tughluq, the price of corn rose to 16 and 17 *jitals* per seer and many people died of starvation. After Fīrūz Shāh's second attack on Sind, with the consequent scarcity in that province, the price of corn rose to 8 and 10 *jitals* per 5 seers, and of pulses to 4 and 5 *tankās* per maund, or 6.4 and 8 *jitals* per seer respectively. The reign of Ibrāhīm Lodī was again a period of exceptionally low prices. A man could then buy 10 maunds of corn, 5 seers of oil and 10 yards of coarse cloth for one *Buhlūlī* which was equivalent to 1.6 *jital* in value. The prices during 'Alā-ud-dīn's reign have been considered as normal. These were (calculating per maund)—wheat 7½ *jitals*, barley 4 *jitals*, paddy or rice 5 *jitals*, pulses 5 *jitals*, lentils 3 *jitals*, sugar (white) 100 *jitals*, sugar (soft) 60 *jitals*, mutton 10 *jitals*, and ghee (clarified butter) 16 *jitals*; muslins of Delhi cost 17 *tankās*[1] a piece, of 'Ālīgarh 6 *tankās*; and blankets of coarse stuff cost 6 *jitals* and those of finer quality 36 *jitals*[2] for each piece. Comparing

[1] The purchasing power of a *tankā* was about twelve times that of the present rupee.

[2] Comparative prices in the reigns of 'Alā-ud-dīn, Muhammad bin Tughluq and Fīrūz Shāh:

Commodities	'Alā-ud-dīn	Muhammad bin Tughluq	Fīrūz Shāh
	(prices in *jitals* per maund)		
Wheat	7½	12	8
Barley	4	8	4
Paddy	5	14	x
Pulses	5	x	x
Lentils	3	4	4
Sugar (white)	100	80	x
Sugar (soft)	60	64	120, 140
Mutton	10	64	x
Ghee	16	x	100

(*J.A.S.B.*, 1935, Vol. I, Letters No. 2, p. 235.)

the prices of goods in the reigns of 'Alā-ud-dīn, Muhammad bin Tughluq and Fīrūz Shāh, we find that, generally speaking, these rose during the reign of the second Sultān but again went down almost to the previous level of 'Alā-ud-dīn's reign during the reign of Fīrūz Shāh. On the whole, food and goods were cheap in the Doāb area as well as in the provinces. Ibn Batūtah observes that he had nowhere seen "a country where the commodities sell cheaper" than in Bengal; eight *dirhams* were sufficient here for the annual expenses of a family of three. But we have no means of estimating the average income or cost of living of an Indian of those days. We should not, moreover, fail to note that the country, especially Bengal, suffered from an exceptional scarcity of money. It is, therefore, rather difficult to determine how far the people were benefited by the low prices of commodities then prevailing.

As regards the standard of living of the different classes of the society, the difference between that of the wealthier classes and of the peasants was "almost antipodal". While the ruling and official classes rolled in opulence and luxury, the tillers of the soil had a very low standard of living. The incidence of taxation must have weighed heavily on them, and their condition became miserable in times of famine, when no adequate relief measures could be provided. Amīr Khusrav significantly remarks that "every pearl in the royal crown is but the crystallised drop of blood fallen from the tearful eyes of the poor peasant". Bābur, who was struck with the scanty requirements of the Indian rural folk, writes: "People disappear completely where they have been living for many years in about a day and a half." Thus the peasants of Medieval India do not seem to have been much better off than their descendants of modern times. But, judged by standards of to-day, they had fewer needs. The villages being economically self-sufficient, the simple requirements of the rural population were supplied locally to their satisfaction. Further, in spite of political revolutions and intrigues at the metropolis, the villagers pursued their ordinary occupations of life with the utmost unconcern. Court politics seldom disturbed the even tenor of village life.

B. Social Life

It was a common practice with the Sultāns and the nobles to maintain slaves, male as well as female. The number of royal slaves (*Bandagān-i-khās*) was usually large. 'Alā-ud-dīn had 50,000 slaves and their number rose to 200,000 under Fīrūz Shāh. Much care was taken of them by their masters, as they formed a

useful source of service and sometimes of pecuniary gain. The Sultāns usually manumitted their slaves after some time, and some of the slaves rose to political and social eminence by dint of their merit and ability. Besides a large number of Indian slaves, of whom the Assam slaves were most liked because of their strong physique, male as well as female slaves were imported from other countries like China, Turkestān, and Persia. The prices of slaves fluctuated according to the courses of wars and famines. The institution of slavery might have served certain purposes for the rulers and the nobles; but at the same time it could not but produce some baneful social consequences. In fact, it was a "stamp of unprogressiveness" and an unhealthy feature of social life.

Dependence of women on their husbands, or other male relatives, was a prominent feature of social life among the Hindus as well as the Muslims. But they enjoyed a position of respect and were expected to observe strict fidelity in their conjugal life. They generally lived in seclusion in the sphere of their homes; and the *Purdah* system became more elaborate, both among the Hindus and the Muslims, except in some coastal towns in Gujarāt, owing chiefly to the general sense of insecurity of the period caused by inroads of foreign invaders, especially the Mongols. The culture of the women varied according to the classes to which they belonged. While the ordinary village women remained absorbed in their domestic duties, some belonging to the upper class cultivated arts and sciences. Rupamatī and Padmāvatī are good examples of educated ladies. Both boys and girls were married at an early age. The practice of *Satī*, or a wife burning herself on the funeral pyre of her husband, was widely prevalent among certain classes. According to Ibn Batūtah, a sort of permit had to be procured from the Sultān of Delhi before the burning of a widow. Though the general standard of social life was high, being marked by charity and other virtues, there were a few vices connected with the passion for wine and women.

3. Literature, Art and Architecture

A. Effect of the Impact of the Indian and the Islamic Civilisations

So immense was the assimilative potentiality of the old Indian civilisation that the earlier invaders of this country, the Greeks, the Sakas and the Huns, were absorbed within the fold of her population and completely lost their identity. But it did not

happen so with the Turko-Afghān invaders of India. In the wake of Muslim invasions, definite social and religious ideas, which differed fundamentally from those of Hindustān, entered into this country and a perfect absorption of the invaders by the original inhabitants could not be possible. The political relations between the new-comers and the indigenous people were sometimes characterised by bitter strife. But whenever two types of civilisation come into close contact with each other for centuries, both are bound to be influenced mutually. Thus, through long association, the growth of the numbers of the converted Indo-Muslim community, and the influence of several liberal movements in India, the Hindu and Muslim communities came to imbibe each other's thoughts and customs; and, beneath the ruffled surface of storm and stress, there flowed a genial current of mutual harmony and toleration in different spheres of life. As a matter of fact, both Hindus and Muslims had mutual admiration for each other's culture, since the early days of the advent of Islam into India, and one of the sources of Muslim mysticism was Indian. Famous Muslim scholars and saints lived and laboured in India during the Medieval period, and they helped the dissemination of the ideas of Islamic philosophy and mysticism in this land. The wholesome spirit of mutual toleration found expression in the growing veneration of the Hindus for the Muslim saints, particularly of the mystic school, and a corresponding Muhammadan practice of venerating Hindu saints; and it ultimately led to the common worship of *Satyapīr* (the True saint). It was probably due to this feeling of friendliness that conversion of the Muslims into the Hindu fold, and reconversion of the Hindus to their original faith, could be possible during this period and later on. It was out of the desire for mutual understanding that Hindu (Sanskrit) religious literature was studied and translated or summarised in the Muslim courts like those of Zain-ul-'Ābidīn in Kāshmīr and Husain Shāh in Bengal. Further, Muslim courts and Muslim preachers and saints were attracted to the study of Hindu philosophy like Yoga and Vedānta and the sciences of medicine and astrology. The Hindu astronomers similarly borrowed from the Muslims technical terms, the Muslim calculations of latitudes and longitudes, some items of the calendar (*Zich*) and a branch of horoscopy called *Tājik*, and in medicine the knowledge of metallic acids and some processes in iatro-chemistry. The growth of Urdu, of the mingling "out of Persian, Arabic, and Turkish words and ideas with languages and concepts of Sanskritic origin, is a proof of the linguistic synthesis of the Hindus and the Muslims". Some Muslims wrote in vernaculars

on topics of Hindu life and tradition, as Malik Muhammad Jaysīa did on Padminī; and Hindu writers wrote in the Persian language on Muslim literary traditions, as Rāi Bhana Mal did in his chronicles. Numerous Muslim poets wrote in Hindī and Hindu poets in Urdu. Amīr Khusrav is known to have been the author of some Hindī works. This assimilation between the two cultures led also to the springing up of new styles of art, architecture and music, "in which the basic element remained the old Hindu, but the finish and outward form became Persian and the purpose served was that of Muslim courts". Some Muslims of aristocratic Hindu origin, or living in a Hindu environment, assimilated the Hindu customs of *Satī* and *Jauhar*. Several intermarriages between the ruling members of the two communities helped this rapprochement and some again were the result of it. These inter-communal marriages, though sometimes tainted with compulsion as a condition of conquest, did much "to soften the acrimonious differences" between the two communities and assist the transplanting of the customs of the one to the fold of the other.

The spirit of harmony and co-operation was not absent in the political field also. Besides retaining, out of necessity, the existing machinery of local administration, the Hindu headmen and accountants of the villages, the Muslim State employed a large number of Hindus, who became prominent in different branches of administration. Thus Medinī Rāi of Chanderī and his friends held high positions in Mālwa; in Bengal, Husain Shāh employed Hindu officers, most prominent amongst whom were Purandar Khān, Rup and Sanātan; the Sultāns of Golkundā employed some Hindus as ministers; Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh of Bijāpur entrusted the Hindus with offices of responsibility and the records of his State were ordinarily kept in the Marāthī language. Sultān Zain-'ul-'Ābidīn of Kāshmīr anticipated Akbar in his pro-Hindu and liberal policy. The Muslim subjects of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh of Bijāpur, described him as "*Jagadguru*" for his patronage of the Hindus in his State. Examples of Rājput chivalry towards the Muslims are not rare. Thus the Rājput hero, Rānā Sanga, was chivalrous enough to respect the independence of his vanquished foe, Mahmūd II of Mālwa; Qutlugh Khān after being defeated by Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn took refuge with Rānā Ban Pal of Santur; and it is well known how Hamīr Deva of Ranthambhor gave shelter to a rebel chief of 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī at the risk of incurring the Sultān's wrath. Even the Vijayanagar Emperors employed Muslims in their military service from the time of Deva Rāya II, and patronised "the cause of Islam in and outside their great

capital". A famous Muslim general, Asad Khān of Bijāpur, was once invited to Vijayanagar to witness the Mahānavamī festival. Rānā Sanga had a contingent of Muslim troops under him in his war with Bābur, and Hīmū, a Hindu Beniā, who rose to be the chief minister of 'Ādil Shāh Sūr, was the commander and leader of the Afghān troops in their last important fight with the Mughuls in A.D. 1556. These official appointments might have been due more to political necessity than to any feeling of goodwill. But there can be no doubt that they facilitated the growth of amity between the Hindus and Muslims. In fact, in different aspects of life—arts and crafts, music and painting, in the styles of buildings, in dress and costume, in games and sports—this assimilation between the two communities had progressed so much that when Bābur came to India he was compelled to notice their peculiar "Hindustānī way". Sir John Marshall has very aptly remarked that "seldom in the history of mankind has the spectacle been witnessed of two civilisations, so vast and so strongly developed, yet so radically dissimilar as the Muhammadan and Hindu, meeting and mingling together. The very contrasts which existed between them, the wide divergences in their culture and their religions, make the history of their impact peculiarly instructive. . . ."

Hinduism could not completely absorb Islam but was in turn influenced by it in two ways. On the one hand, the proselytising zeal of Islam strengthened conservatism in the orthodox circles of the Hindus, who, with a view to fortifying their position against the spread of the Islamic faith, increased the stringency of the caste rules and formulated a number of rules in the *Smriti* works. The most famous writers of this class were Mādhava of Vijayanagar, whose commentary on a *Parāsara Smriti* work entitled *Kālanirnaya* was written between A.D. 1335–1360; Viśveśvara, author of *Madanapārijāta*, a *Smriti* work written for King Madanapāla (A.D. 1360–1370); the famous commentator of Manu, Kulluka, a Bengali author belonging to the Benares school by domicile; and Raghunandan of Bengal, a contemporary of Chaitanya. On the other hand, some of the democratic principles of Islam made their way into the social and religious systems of the Hindus, and led to the rise of liberal movements under some saintly preachers. With some differences in details, all these reformers were exponents of the liberal *Bhakti* cult, the message of which they sought to carry before the unlettered masses. They preached the fundamental equality of all religions and the unity of Godhead, held that the dignity of man depended on his actions and not on his birth, protested against excessive ritualism and formalities of religion and

domination of the priests, and emphasised simple devotion and faith as the means of salvation for one and all.

Among them, Rāmānanda occupies the first place in point of time, though it should be noted that there are differences of opinion regarding the dates of his birth and death. Born at Allahābād in a Kānyakubja Brāhmaṇa family, Rāmānanda travelled through the holy places of Northern India. He was a worshipper of Rāma and preached the doctrine of *Bhakṭi* in Hindī, to members of all classes and both sexes. Thus, of his twelve principal disciples,[1] one was a barber, another a cobbler and the third a Muhammadan weaver.

Another famous Vaishṇava saint was Vallabhāchārya, an exponent of the Kṛishṇa cult. He was born near Benares in A.D. 1479 of a Telugu Brāhmaṇa family, when the latter had come there on pilgrimage. He showed signs of genius in his early life. After finishing his education he went to the court of Kṛishṇadeva Rāya of Vijayanagar, where he defeated some Saiva *paṇdits* in a public discussion. He advocated renunciation of the world and "insisted on the complete identity of both soul and world with the Supreme spirit". His monism was known as *Suddha-advaita* or "Pure Non-Duality". But abuses later on appeared among the followers of Vallabhāchārya, and, as Monier-Williams writes, "Vallabhāchāryaism became in its degenerate form the Epicureanism of the East".

The greatest and most popular of the Vaishṇava saints was Chaitanya (1485–1533). Born in a learned Brāhmaṇa family of Nadiā in Bengal in A.D. 1485, Chaitanya displayed a wonderful literary acumen in his early life and his soul soon aspired to rise above the fetters of this world. He renounced it at the age of twenty-four and spent the rest of his life in preaching his message of love and devotion—eighteen years in Orissa, and six years in the Deccan, Brindāvan, Gaur and other places. He is regarded by his followers as an incarnation of Vishṇu. The essence of Chaitanyaism has been thus expressed by Kṛishṇadās Kavirāj, the author of *Chaitanyacharitāmrita*, the famous biography of Chaitanya: "if a creature adores Kṛishṇa and serves his *Guru*, he is released from the meshes of illusion and attains to Kṛishṇa's feet", and "leaving these (i.e. temptations) and the religious systems based on caste, (the true Vaishṇava) helplessly takes refuge with Kṛishṇa". Thus he was opposed to priestly ritualism and preached faith in Hari. He believed that through love and

[1] Anantānanda, Kabīr, Pīpā, Bhavānanda, Sukha, Sursura, Padmāvatī Narhari, Raidāsa, Dhana, Saina and the wife of Sursura.

devotion, and song and dance, a state of ecstasy could be produced in which the personal presence of God would be realised. His gospel was meant for all, irrespective of caste and creed, and some of his disciples were drawn from the lower strata of Hindu society and from among Muslims. The influence of Chaitanya's teachings on the masses of the people has been wide and profound.

In Mahārāshtra the religion of devotion was preached by Nāmadeva; and among his followers a few were Muslim converts to Hinduism. Nāmadeva, who belonged to a caste of tailors or calico-printers, flourished probably during the first half of the fifteentn century.[1] With his faith in the unity of Godhead, he did not set much store by idol-worship and external observances of religion. He believed that salvation could be attained only through love of God. Thus he said:

"Love for him who filleth my heart shall never be sundered,
Nāma has applied his heart to the true Name.
As the love between a child and his mother,
So is my soul imbued in the God."

Kabīr made the most earnest efforts to foster a spirit of harmony between Hinduism and Islam. His life is shrouded in a good deal of obscurity, and the dates of his birth and death are uncertain.[2] He flourished either towards the close of the fourteenth century or in the first quarter of the fifteenth century. A legend tells us that he was born of a Brāhmaṇa widow, who left him on the side of a tank in Benares, and was then found and brought up by a Muhammadan weaver and his wife. He is represented by tradition to have been a disciple of Rāmānanda. Though, as Dr. Carpenter puts it, "the whole background of Kabīr's thought is Hindu", he was also influenced to a great extent by Sūfī saints and poets with whom he came in contact. Thus he preached a religion of love, which would promote unity amongst all classes and creeds. To him "Hindu and Turk were pots of same clay: Allah and Rāma were but different names". He wrote:

[1] There are differences of opinion about the date of his birth. According to Macauliffe (*The Sikh Religion*, Vol. VI, p. 18) it is A.D. 1270; Dr. Bhandarkar (*Vaishnavism and Saivaism*, p. 89) and Carpenter (*Theism in Medieval India*, p. 452) place him in the fourteenth century. Dr. Farquhar, however, writes that he flourished "from 1400 to 1430 or thereabouts" (*J.R.A.S.* 1920, p. 186).

[2] For different opinions, *vide* Tara Chand, *Influence of Islam on Indian Civilisation*, pp. 146–7. According to Macauliffe and Bhandarkar, A.D. 1398, but according to Westcott, Farquhar, Burns and others A.D. 1440 is the date of his birth.

"It is needless to ask of a saint the caste to which he belongs;

. . . . .

The barber has sought God, the washerman and the carpenter—
Even Raidas was a seeker after God.
The Rishi Swapacha was a tanner by caste.
Hindus and Moslems alike have achieved that
End, where remains no mark of distinction."

Kabīr did not believe in the efficacy of ritual, or external formalities, either of Hinduism or of Islam; to him the true means of salvation was *Bhajan* or devotional worship, together with the freedom of the soul from all sham, insincerity, hypocrisy and cruelty.

Thus he proclaimed:

"It is not by fasting and repeating prayers and the creed
That one goeth to heaven;
The inner veil of the temple of Mecca
Is in man's heart, if the truth be known.
Make thy mind thy Kaaba, thy body its enclosing temple,
Conscience its prime teacher;
Sacrifice wrath, doubt, and malice;
Make patience thine utterance of the five prayers.
The Hindus and the Mussalmans have the same Lord."

Another great preacher of the time was Nānak, the founder of Sikhism and the reviver of the pure monotheistic doctrine of the Upanishads. He was born in a Khatri family of Talwāndī (modern Nankana), about thirty-five miles to the south-west of the city of Lahore, in A.D. 1469, and spent his whole life in preaching his gospel of universal toleration, based on all that was good in Hinduism and Islam. As a matter of fact, his mission was to put an end to the conflict of religions. Like Kabīr, he preached the unity of Godhead, condemned with vehemence the formalism of both Hinduism and Islam. Thus he wrote:

"Religion consisteth not in mere words;
He who looketh on all men as equal is religious.
Religion consisteth not in wandering to tombs or places of cremation, or sitting in attitudes of contemplation.
Religion consisteth not in wandering in foreign countries, or in bathing at places of pilgrimage.
Abide pure amidst the impurities of the world;
Thus shalt thou find the way to religion."

While advocating a middle path between extreme asceticism and pleasure-seeking, Nānak exhorted his followers to discard hypocrisy, selfishness and falsehood. He proclaimed:

"Make continence thy furnace, resignation thy goldsmith,
Understanding thine anvil, divine knowledge thy tools,
The fear of God thy bellows, austerities thy fire,
Divine love thy crucible, and melt God's name therein.
In such a true mint the Word shall be coined.
This is the practice of those on whom God looked with an eye of favour."

Nānak's religion being a proselytising one, several Muslims were converted to it, and it gathered momentum under his successors.

B. Development of Provincial Literature

Besides producing far-reaching social and religious effects, the reform movements also gave a great impetus to the development of Indian literature in different parts of India. While the orthodox scholars continued to write in Sanskrit, the religious reformers, with their aim of preaching before the uneducated masses, wrote and spoke in a medium which could be easily understood by them. Thus Rāmānanda and Kabīr preached in Hindī and did much to enrich its poetry; and the *dohās* and *sakhīs* of Kabīr, permeated with devotional fervour, are brilliant specimens of Hindī literature. Nāmadeva greatly helped the development of Marāthī literature; Mīrā Bāī and some other preachers of the Rādha-Kṛishṇa cult sang in *Brajabhāshā;* Nānak and his disciples encouraged Punjābī and Gurumukhī; and Bengali literature owes a heavy debt to the Vaishṇava teachers. The famous Vaishṇava poet Chandīdās, who was born, probably towards the end of the fourteenth century, in the village of Nānnūr in the Bīrbhūm district of Bengal, is still held in great esteem and his lyrics are known even to the common folk of Bengal. His contemporary, Vidyāpati Thākur, though a native of Mithilā, is regarded as a poet of Bengal and his memory is venerated by the people of this province. The patronage of the princely courts also considerably helped the growth of literature. Vidyāpati was the court poet of a Hindu chief named Śiva Simha. The Muslim rulers of Bengal engaged scholars to translate the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* from Sanskrit into Bengali, which they understood and spoke. Himself a learned man, Barbak Shāh patronised scholars like Rāimukut Brihaspati Miśra, a highly

accomplished and famous writer of several works, Mālādhar Basu, who commenced writing his Śrīkṛishṇa-Vijaya in 1473, and on whom this Sultān conferred the title of Gunrāj Khān, and Krittivāsa, whose Bengali version of the Rāmāyaṇa has been regarded by some as the "Bible of Bengal." Sultān Nusrat Shāh of Gaur had the *Mahābhārata* translated into Bengali. Vidyāpati says much in praise of this Sultān and also of Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn. Husain Shāh's general, Parāgal Khān, caused another translation of the *Mahābhārata* to be made by Parameśvara, also known as the Kavindra, and Parāgal Khān's son, Chutī Khān, governor of Chittagong, employed Śrīkara Nandī to translate the *Aśvamedha Parva* of the *Mahābhārata* into Bengali. We have already noted what great encouragement was given to the development of Telugu literature by the Vijayanagar court.

C. Literary Activity in Sanskrit

The period was not entirely barren of important compositions in Sanskrit, religious as well as secular, though in this respect it suffers in comparison with the preceding two or three centuries. About A.D. 1300 Pārthasārathī Miśra wrote several works on the *Karma Mimānsā*, of which the *Śāstra Dīpikā* was studied most widely. Some works which expounded the doctrines of the Yoga, Vaiśeshika, and Nyāya systems of philosophy were produced during this period. The more important dramas of the time were *Hammīr-mada-mardana* by Jay Singh Surī (A.D. 1219–1229), *Pradyumna-abhyudaya* by the Kerala prince Ravivarman, *Pratāp Rudra Kalyān* by Vidyānāth (A.D. 1300), *Pārvatī Parinaya* by Vāmana Bhatta Bāna (A.D. 1400), *Gangādāsa Pratāpa Vilāsa*, celebrating the fight of a prince of Chāmpāner against Muhammad II of Gujarāt, by Gangādhar, and the *Vidagdha Mādhava* and the *Lalita Mādhava*, written about A.D. 1532 by Rupa Goswamī, minister of Husain Shāh of Bengal, and author of no less than twenty-five works in Sanskrit. *Smriti* and grammatical literature flourished during this period in Mithilā and Bengal, the most famous writers being Padmanābha Datta, Vidyāpati Upādhyāya and Vāchaspati of Mithilā and Raghunandan of Bengal. It was also marked by the production of a mass of Jaina literature, secular as well as religious. The Vijayanagar rulers extended considerable patronage to scholars like Sāyana, his brother, Mādhava Vidyāranya, and others, and there was consequently a wide Sanskrit culture. We find instances of Muslim scholars possessing a knowledge of Sanskrit.

D. Persian Literature and Muslim Education

The Sultāns and Amīrs of Delhi, and the Muslim rulers and nobles in the provinces, naturally encouraged literary activities in Persian, which they appreciated better. Amīr Khusrav declared with pride that Delhi developed into an intellectual competitor of Bukhārā, the famous university-city of Central Asia. The then Muslim rulers of India extended patronage to the Persian scholars who flocked to their courts from other parts of Asia under the pressure of Mongol inroads; established institutions for Muslim learning at Delhi, Jullundur, Fīrūzābād and other places; founded libraries, the most important one being the Imperial Library at Delhi, of which Amīr Khusrav was appointed the librarian by Jalāl-ud-dīn Khaljī; and also helped the growth of Muslim literary societies. The most famous of the Indian scholars who wrote in Persian during this period was Amīr Khusrav He was a prolific writer, whose genius unfolded itself in poetry, prose and music, and whom destiny granted a long tenure of life. He first rose to fame during the reign of Balban and was the tutor of Prince Muhammad, the eldest son of the Sultān. Subsequently he became the court-poet of 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī, also enjoyed the patronage of Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq, and died in A.D. 1324–1325. Another poet of the time, whose fame was recognised outside India, was Shaikh Najm-ud-dīn Hasan, popularly known as Hasan-i-Dihlavī. The first Khalji ruler did not forget to patronise learning, and his successor, 'Alā-ud-dīn, also seems to have been an enthusiastic friend of it. We are told by Barnī that "the most wonderful thing which people saw in 'Alā-ud-dīn's reign was the multitude of great men of all nationalities, masters of every science and experts in every art. The capital of Delhi, by the presence of these unrivalled men of great talents, had become the envy of Baghdād, the rival of Cairo, and the equal of Constantinople". The pious and learned scholar Nizām-ud-dīn Auliyā and several other scholars flourished during this reign. Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq, too, encouraged learned men; and, in spite of his fanciful projects, Muhammad bin Tughluq, himself a man of accomplishments, freely patronised poets, logicians, philosophers and physicians, and held discussion with them in his court. The most notable of the literary men of his time was Maulāna Muaiyyan-ud-dīn Umrānī, who wrote commentaries on the *Husaini*, *Talkhis*, and *Miftāh*. Fīrūz Shāh, himself the author of *Fatuhāt-i-Fīrūz Shāhī*, showed great zeal for the cause of education and established several colleges with mosques attached to them.

Among the learned men of his time, the most eminent were Qāzi 'Abdul Muqtadir Shānihi, Maulāna Khwājagi, and Ahmad Thānesvarī. Among the Lodīs, Sultān Sikandar was himself a poet, and gave considerable encouragement to learning. Most of the rulers of the Bahmanī kingdom and other independent Muslim dynasties, like those of Bijāpur, Ahmadnagar, Golkundā, Mālwa, Jaunpur, Bengal, and even Multān, were also patrons of letters. The Muslim writers showed their skill in a branch of study which had been comparatively neglected by the Hindus. They wrote several first-rate historical books in elegant prose. Thus we have Minhāj-ud-dīn's *Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī*, which is a general history of the Islamic world and was named after one of his patrons, Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd. Amīr Khusrav's historical *mesnevis* are full of valuable information, and his *Ta'rīkh-i-'Alāi* especially "contains an interesting account of the first years of the reign of 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī". The most famous historian of the period was Ziā-ud-dīn Barnī, a contemporary of Muhammad bin Tughluq and Fīrūz Shāh. Two other important historical works of the time are the *Ta'rīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī* of Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afīf, written during the reign of Fīrūz Shāh, and the *Ta'rīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī* of Yahiyā bin Ahmad Sarhindi, which was written about eighty years after the death of Muhammad bin Tughluq and was largely used by later writers.

E. Art and Architecture

It is inaccurate to describe the architecture of the period as "Indo-Saracenic" or "Pathān", as some scholars like Fergusson and others have done. Nor can it be regarded as entirely Indian in "soul and body", as Havell would ask us to believe. In fact, it represented a blending of Indian and Islamic styles, as did certain other aspects of the culture of the time. Sir John Marshall observed that "Indo-Islamic art is not merely a local variety of Islamic art", nor is it merely "a modified form of Hindu art. . . . Broadly speaking, Indo-Islamic architecture derives its character from both sources, though not always in an equal degree". There is no doubt that there existed in India certain Brāhmaṇical, Buddhist and Jaina styles, while Islamic influences were slowly entering into this land from the middle of the seventh century A.D. At the same time, we should note that what we generally call Islamic art was not of a homogeneous and single type; but the followers of Islam, like the Arabs, the Persians, or the Turks, brought in their train the art of different parts of

QUTB MIN[illegible] DELHI

Western and Central Asia, Northern Africa and South-Western Europe. The mingling of these with the different indigenous styles of old Indian art during this period, according to the needs of religion and personal taste, led to the growth of new "Indian" styles of architecture, distinct in every province, like Jaunpur, Bengal, Bijāpur, Gujarāt, etc. In Delhi architecture Islamic influences predominated owing to the numerical strength of the Muslims there. "At Jaunpur, on the other hand, and in the Deccan, the local styles enjoyed greater ascendancy, while in Bengal the conquerors not only adopted the fashion of building in brick, but

ARCHED SCREEN OF QUTB-UD-DĪN AIBAK ON THE QUWWAT-UL-ISLAM MASJID, DELHI

adorned their structures with chiselled and moulded enrichments frankly imitated from Hindu prototypes. So, too, in Western India they appropriated to themselves almost *en bloc* the beautiful Gujarātī style, which has yielded some of the finest buildings of medieval India; and in Kāshmīr they did the same with the striking wooden architecture which must have been long prevalent in that part of the Himālayas."

This amalgamation of exotic and indigenous architectural styles was possible owing to certain factors. The Muslims had of necessity to employ Indian craftsmen and sculptors, who were naturally guided in their work by the existing art traditions of their country. Further, in the earlier period of Muslim invasions, mosques were

constructed out of the materials of Hindu and Jaina temples, and sometimes the temples themselves were only modified to some extent to suit the requirements of the conquerors. Again, in spite of some striking contrasts between the Indian and Islamic styles, there were two points of resemblance between them which



QUWWAT-UL-ISLAM MASJID, DELHI
(Carvings on screen extension)

favoured their fusion. One characteristic feature of many Hindu temples, as well as of Muslim mosques, was "the open court encompassed by chambers or colonnades, and such temples as were built on this plan naturally lent themselves to conversion into mosques and would be the first to be adapted for that purpose by the conquerors. Again, a fundamental characteristic that supplied a common link between the two styles was the fact that

both Islamic and Hindu art were inherently decorative. Ornament was as vital to the one as to the other; both were dependent on it for their very being".

The best specimens of the Delhi style are offered by the Qutb group of mosques, the most famous of which is the Qutb Minār, marked by free-standing towers, calligraphic inscriptions and stalactite corbelling beneath the balconies. The two principal monuments of 'Alā-ud-dīn's reign—the *Jamā'at Khāna Masjid*



MASJID AT THE DARGĀH OF NIZĀM-UD-DĪN AULIYĀ

at the *Dargāh* of Nizām-ud-dīn Auliyā and the *'Alāī Darwāza* at the Qutb Minār—show the growing preponderance of Muslim ideas over those of the Hindu architects. The architecture of the Tughluq period lost the splendour, luxuriance and variety which characterised that of the Slave and Khaljī regimes; it became prosaic, simple, austere and formal. This was due to the religious ideas of the Tughluqs and to the comparatively poor condition of the State finances during their rule. Under the Sayyids and the Lodīs, attempts were made to revive the animated style of the Khaljī period. But these succeeded only to a limited extent, and

ALĀĪ DARWĀZA AT THE QUTB MINĀR, DELHI

TOMB OF FĪRŪZ SHĀH, SON OF RAJAB, DELHI

ATĀ A DEVĪ MASJID, JAUNPUR

CHHOTĀ SONĀ MASJID, GAUH

the style could not "shake off the deadening effect of the Tughluq period".

Between A.D. 1400 and 1478, during the reigns of Ibrāhīm, Mahmūd and Husain Sharqī, a new style of architecture developed in Jaunpur, which shows the indubitable influence of Hindu art. Its massive sloping walls, square pillars, smaller galleries and cloisters are clearly Hindu features, designed by Hindu masons; and the mosques of Jaunpur have no minarets of the usual type. In fact, many of the new buildings of Jaunpur were built out of the materials of old temples for a new purpose. The *Atāla Devi Masjid*, founded

BARĀ SONĀ MASJID, GAUR

in A.D. 1377, but completed in A.D. 1408, is one of the brilliant specimens of the Jaunpur style.

In Bengal also there grew up a mixed style of architecture, characterised by the use of bricks in the main, "the subsidiary use of stone, the use of pointed arches on short pillars, and the Muslim adaptation of the traditional Hindu temple style of curvilinear cornices copied from bamboo structures, and of beautifully carved Hindu symbolic decorative designs like the Lotus". The *Ādīna Masjid* at Pándua of 400 domes, built by Sikandar in A.D. 1368, is renowned for its magnitude and beauty. The other famous mosques of this province are the *Chhotā Sonā Masjid* (Smaller Golden Mosque), built by Walī Muhammad during the reign of Husain Shāh between

A.D. 1493–1519; the *Barā Sonā Masjid* (Greater Golden Mosque), completed by Nusrat Shāh at Gaur in 1526; and the *Qadam Rasūl*, built by the same Sultān in A.D. 1530.

The province of Gujarāt also witnessed the growth of a beautiful style of architecture. A splendid indigenous style had already flourished there before the coming of the Muslims, and the buildings of the conquerors bear unmistakable signs of the influence of that style, though arches were occasionally used for symbolical

ĀDĪNA MASJID, PĀNDUA

purposes. Thus we find the use of fine wood-carving and also of delicate stone lattices and ornaments in the buildings of the new capital city, Ahmadābād, which was constructed by Ahmad Shāh, during A.D. 1411–1441, out of the ruins of old temples and buildings. The *Jāmi' Masjid*, the construction of which was begun in A.D. 1411, has 260 pillars supporting 15 stone domes, made of horizontally projecting courses in the indigenous style. Dr. Burgess, who has dealt exhaustively with the history and features of ancient

and medieval architecture in his five volumes of the Archaeological Survey of Western India, justly describes this style as "combining all the beauty and finish of the native art with a certain magnificence which is deficient in their own works". In the numerous buildings, mosques and tombs, built in Gujarāt since the accession of the Ahmad Shāhī rulers, the tradition of the old Indian art was predominant, though it was modified in certain respects according to the requirements of the followers of Islam.

At Dhār, the old capital of the kingdom of Mālwa, two mosques

TOMB OF HŪSHANG SHĀH

were built wholly out of the remains of old buildings; the domes and pillars of these mosques were of Hindu form. But the buildings at Māndū, where the capital was soon transferred, were marked by the predominance of Muslim art traditions, as those of Delhi; "the borrowing or imitating" of native forms "seems to have been suppressed and the buildings clung steadily to the pointed arch style". Among the many buildings of splendid architectural beauty built in the fortified city of Māndū, situated in an extensive plateau over-looking the Narmadā, the following deserve mention—the *Jāmi' Masjid*, which was planned and begun by

Hūshang and completed by Mahmūd Khaljī, the *Hindolā Mahal*, the *Jahāj Mahal*, Hūshang's tomb, and Bāz Bahādur's and Rupamatī's palaces. Marble and sandstone were used in many of these edifices.

The Muslim Sultāns of Kāshmīr continued the old tradition of stone and wooden architecture but grafted on it "structural forms and decorative motifs peculiarly associated with Islam". Thus here also we find a blending of Hindu and Muslim ideas of art.

In South India the architecture of the Bahmanīds, who were patrons of art, letters and sciences, was a composite mixture of

TOMB OF FĪRŪZ SHĀH BAHMANI, GULBARGA

several elements—Indian, Turkish, Egyptian and Persian—the last of which was well-marked in some of the buildings like the *Jāmi' Masjid* at Gulbarga, the *Chānd Minār* at Daulatābād (1435) and the College of Mahmūd Gāwān at Bīdar (1472). Many of the Bahmanī buildings were built on the sites of the old temples and out of their materials, and thus the influence of old Hindu art could not be avoided. Turkish and Egyptian elements entered through West Asiatic and African adventurers, who got employment in the Bahmanī kingdom; and the Persian element through the Persians, who poured into that kingdom in the latter half of the fifteenth century. The native Deccan art, however, began

to reassert itself in growing vigour from the end of the fifteenth century. As the monuments which the 'Ādil Shāhīs of Bijāpur built in the next century were constructed by Indian artists and craftsmen, "it was inevitable", writes Sir John Marshall, "that Indian genius should rise superior to foreign influence and stamp itself more and more deeply on these creations". We have already discussed the splendid outburst of art and architecture in the Vijayanagar Empire.

TOMB OF MUHAMMAD 'ĀDIL SHĀH, BIJĀPUR

Thus we find that, in spite of some bitterness in political relations, the impact of Hindu and Islamic civilisations was producing harmony and mutual understanding in the spheres of society, culture and art, during the Turko-Afghān period. This harmony developed in the time of the great Mughul, Akbar, to an unprecedented degree and was not wholly lost even in the time of his successors and also of the later Mughuls.

The preachings of the saintly teachers of India with their ideal of uplift of the masses, the tolerant ideas of the Sūfī saints and scholars, and the growth of Indian provincial literature, might be regarded

as signs of modernism appearing as a result of the fusion of two civilisations, while the medieval Sultānate was hastening towards disintegration. Another noticeable feature of Indian history on the eve of Bābur's invasion was the rise or growth of indigenous States, like Vijayanagar, Orissa and Mewār, as a sort of protest against foreign domination. We should also note that the rulers of the independent Muslim kingdoms that arose on the ruins of the medieval Muslim Empire cannot all be regarded as aliens; the rulers of Gujarāt, Ahmadnagar and Berar were of indigenous origin. Many of the States, whether Hindu or Muslim, that grew up at this time represented local movements for "self-determination". But their chances were destroyed by another Turkish incursion, of which the leader was Bābur. Thus Bābur's invasion gave a new turn to the history of India.

PART II

Book II

THE MUGHUL EMPIRE

CHAPTER I

MUGHUL-AFGHĀN CONTEST FOR SUPREMACY IN INDIA, A.D. 1526–1556

1. Bābur

THE history of India from A.D. 1526 to 1556 is mainly the story of the Mughul-Afghān contest for supremacy in this land. The previous Mughul (Mongol) inroads into India did not produce any tangible result except that they added, through the settlement of the "New Mussalmāns", a new element to the Indian population and at times harassed the Turko-Afghān Sultāns. But the invasion of Tīmūr, who occupied a province of the Empire, the Punjab, accelerated the fall of the decadent Sultānate. One of his descendants, Bābur, was destined to attempt a systematic conquest of Northern India and thus to lay here the foundation of a new Turkish dominion,[1] which being lost in the time of his son and successor, Humāyūn, in the face of an Afghān revival, was restored by the year 1556 and was gradually extended by Akbar. In fact, there were three phases in the history of the Mughul conquest of India. The first phase (1526–1530) was occupied with the subjugation of the Afghāns and the Rājputs under Rānā Sanga. The second phase (1530–1540) commenced with the reign of Humāyūn, who made unsuccessful attempts to subjugate Mālwa, Gujarāt and Bengal, but was expelled from India by Sher Shāh, which meant the revival of the Afghān power. The third phase (1545–1556) was marked by the restoration of the Mughul dominion by Humāyūn and its consolidation by Akbar.

Bābur, a Chaghātai Turk, was descended on his father's side from Tīmūr, and was connected on his mother's side with Chingīz Khān.

[1] The so-called Mughuls really belonged to a branch of the Turks named after Chaghātai, the second son of Chingīz Khān, the famous Mongol leader, who came to possess Central Asia and Turkestān, the land of the Turks. The establishment of the Mughul dominion in India can very well be regarded as "an event in Islamic and world history" in the sense that it meant a fresh triumph for Islam in India, at a time when its followers were gaining success in other parts of the world. Constantinople had been captured by the Turks in A.D. 1453, Sulaimān the Magnificent (1520–1566) extended the authority of the Turkish Empire over South-eastern Europe; and in Persia, Ismā'īl Safawī (1500–1524) laid the foundation of the famous Safawī Empire.

In 1494 he inherited from his father, at the age of eleven, the small principality of Farghāna, now a province of Chinese Turkestān. But his early life was full of difficulties, which, however, proved to be a blessing in disguise by training him adequately to fight with the vicissitudes of fortune. He cherished the desire of recovering the throne of Tīmūr, but was thwarted by his kinsmen and near relatives at Farghāna and the rivalry of the Uzbeg chief Shaibānī Khān. His two attempts to take possession of the coveted city of Samarqānd in 1497 and 1503 ended in failure. To add to his misfortunes, he was deprived of his own patrimony of Farghāna and had to spend his days as a homeless wanderer for about a year. But even in this period of dire adversity, he formed the bold design of conquering Hindustān like his great ancestor Tīmūr, the story of whose Indian exploits he heard from an old lady of one hundred and eleven, mother of a village headman with whom he had found shelter for some time. Thus taking advantage of a rebellion in another part of the dominions of the Uzbegs, whose rising power had kept off the Tīmūrids from their principalities, Bābur occupied Kābul in A.D. 1504. Being able to secure the help of Shāh Isma'īl Safavī of Persia against Shaibānī Khān, the Uzbeg chief, Bābur tried once again to occupy Samarqānd in October, 1511, but the Uzbegs under Shaibānī's successor finally defeated him in 1512. Bābur's ambitions towards the north-west being thus foiled, he decided to try his luck in the south-east, and led several expeditions in this direction, which were in the nature of reconnaissances, before he got an opportunity to advance into the heart of Hindustān after twelve years.

This opportunity came to Bābur when he was invited to India by a discontented party. It has already been pointed out how India was then distracted by the ambitions, disaffections and rivalries of the nobles, and the Delhi Sultānate existed in nothing but in name. The last nail in its coffin was driven by the ambition and revengeful spirit of some of its nobles. Two of them, Daulat Khān, the most powerful noble of the Punjab, who was discontented with Ibrāhīm Lodī because of the cruel treatment he had meted out to his son, Dilawar Khān, and 'Ālam Khān, an uncle of Ibrāhīm Lodī and a pretender to the throne of Delhi, went to the length of inviting Bābur to invade India. Probably Rānā Sanga had some negotiations with Bābur about this time.

Bābur had for some time been cherishing the ambition of invading Hindustān. His early training in the school of adversity had implanted in him the spirit of adventure. He at once responded to

the invitation, entered the Punjab and occupied Lahore in 1524. But his Indian confederates, Daulat Khān and 'Ālam Khān, soon realised their mistake. When they saw that Bābur had no desire to give up his Indian conquests, they turned against him. This compelled Bābur to retire to Kābul, where he began to collect reinforcements with a view to striking once again.

The blow was not long in coming. He marched from Kābul in November, 1525, occupied the Punjab, and compelled Daulat Khān Lodī to submit. The more difficult task of conquering Delhi, which was certainly within the horizon of Bābur's ambition, was still to be accomplished. So he proceeded against Ibrāhīm Lodī, the nominal ruler of the shrivelled Afghān Empire, and met him on the historic field of Pānīpat on the 21st April, 1526. He had with him a large park of artillery and an army of 12,000 men, while the numerical strength of the troops of Ibrāhīm was vastly superior, being 100,000 according to Bābur's estimate. But Bābur had the strength of character and experience of a veteran general, while his enemy, as we are told by Bābur himself, "was an inexperienced man, careless in his movements, who marched without order, halted or retired without method and engaged without foresight". Thus by superior strategy and generalship and the use of artillery[1] Bābur won a decisive victory over the Lodī Sultān, who, after a desperate resistance, fell on the field of battle with the flower of his army. "By the grace and mercy of Almighty God," Bābur wrote, "this difficult affair was made easy to me, and that mighty army, in the space of half a day, was laid in the dust." Bābur quickly occupied Delhi and Āgra.

But the Mughul conquest of Hindustān was not an accomplished fact as a result of Bābur's victory over Ibrāhīm. It did not give him the virtual sovereignty over the country, because there were other strong powers like the Afghān military chiefs, and the Rājputs under Rānā Sanga, who also then aspired after political supremacy and were thus sure to oppose him. As a modern writer has aptly remarked, "the magnitude of Bābur's task could be properly realised when we say that it actually began with Pānīpat. Pānīpat set his foot on the path of empire-building, and in this path the first great obstacle was the opposition of the Afghān tribes" under a number of military chiefs, each one of whom exercised almost undisputed power within his domains or *jāgīrs*. Nevertheless, the battle of Pānīpat has its own significance in the sense that it marked the foundation of Mughul dominion in India.

[1] We have already pointed out that this was not the first occasion when artillery was used in India.

Shortly after occupying the Doāb, Bābur suppressed the Afghān nobles in the north, south and east of it. He sent his own nobles to the unconquered parts of the country to expel the Afghān chiefs therefrom, while he engaged himself at Āgra in organising his resources with a view to meeting the brave Rājput chief, Rānā Sanga, a collision with whom was inevitable. As a matter of fact, it took place almost before the task of subduing the Afghān nobles had been completed. Rānā Sanga, a veteran and intrepid warrior, marched to Bayāna, where he was joined by Hasan Khān Mewāti and some other Muslim supporters of the Lodī dynasty. Thus the Rājputs and some of the Indian Muslims allied themselves together with the determination to prevent the imposition of another foreign yoke on India. But all the Afghān chiefs could not combine with the Rājputs at this critical moment, and thus Bābur's task became comparatively easy. The course of Indian history might have taken a different turn if he had had to encounter the united strength of the Hindus and all the Muslims of India.

Rānā Sanga, the hero of Rājput national revival, was certainly a more formidable adversary than Ibrāhīm. He marched with an army, composed of 120 chiefs, 80,000 horse and 500 war elephants, and the rulers of Mārwār, Amber, Gwālior, Ajmer, and Chanderī, and Sultān Mahmūd Lodī (another son of Sultān Sikandar Lodī), whom Rānā Sanga had acknowledged as the ruler of Delhi, joined him. Moreover, the Rājputs, being "energetic, chivalrous, fond of battle and bloodshed, animated by a strong national spirit, were ready to meet face to face the boldest veterans of the camp, and were at all times prepared to lay down their life for their honour". Bābur's small army was struck with terror and panic, and he himself also fully realised the magnitude of his task. But he possessed an indomitable spirit, and without being unnerved tried to infuse fresh courage and enthusiasm into the hearts of his dismayed soldiers. He broke his drinking cups, poured out all the liquor that he had with him on the ground, vowed not to take strong drink any longer, and appealed to his men in a stirring speech.

This produced the desired effect, and all his soldiers swore on the Holy Quran to fight for him. The Mughuls and the Indians met in a decisive contest at Khānua or Kānwā, a village almost due west of Āgra, on the 16th March, 1527. The Rājputs fought with desperate valour, but Bābur, by using similar tactics as at Pānipat, triumphed over them. The defeat of the Rājputs was complete. The Rānā escaped with the help of some of his followers, but died broken-hearted after about two years. Bābur followed

up his success at Khānua by crossing the Jumnā and storming the fortress of Chanderī, in spite of the gallant opposition of the Rājputs.

The battle of Khānua is certainly one of the decisive battles of Indian history. In a sense, its results were more significant than those of the first battle of Pānīpat. The battle of Pānīpat marked the defeat of the titular Sultān of Delhi, who had in fact ceased to command sovereign authority, while that of Khānua resulted in the defeat of the powerful Rājput confederacy. The latter thus destroyed the chance of political revival of the Rājputs, for which they had made a bid on the decay of the Turko-Afghān Sultānate. It is, of course, far from the truth to say that the Rājputs "ceased henceforth to be a dominant factor in the politics of Hindustān". In fact, their retirement from the field of politics was only temporary. They revived once again after about thirty years and exercised profound influence on the history of the Mughul Empire. Even Sher Shāh had to reckon with Rājput hostility. But the temporary eclipse of the Rājputs after Khānua facilitated Bābur's task in India and made possible the foundation of a new foreign rule. Rushbrook Williams is right when he says that before the battle of Khānua, "the occupation of Hindustān might have been looked upon as a mere episode in Bābur's career of adventure; but from henceforth it becomes the keynote of his activities for the remainder of his life. His days of wandering in search of a fortune are now over; the fortune is his and he has but to show himself worthy of it. And it is significant of the new stage in his career, which this battle marks, that never afterwards does he have to stake his throne and life upon the issue of a stricken field. Fighting there is and fighting in plenty to be done; but it is fighting for the extension of his power, for the reduction of rebels, for the ordering of his kingdom. It is never fighting for his throne. And it is also significant of Bābur's grasp of vital issues that from henceforth the centre of gravity of his power is shifted from Kābul to Hindustān".

We have already noted how Bābur hurried to meet the Rājputs by leaving the task of thorough subjugation of the Afghān chiefs incomplete. But he could now turn his undivided attention to it. He met the allied Afghāns of Bihār and Bengal on the banks of the Gogrā, near the junction of that river with the Ganges above Patna, and inflicted a crushing defeat on them on the 6th May, 1529. Thus, as a result of three battles, a considerable portion of Northern India was reduced to submission by Bābur, who became the master of a kingdom extending from the Oxus to the

Gogrā and from the Himālayas to Gwālior, though there remained certain gaps to be filled in here and there.

But Bābur was not destined to enjoy for long the fruits of his hard-won victories. He died at Āgra at the age of forty-seven or forty-eight, on the 26th December, 1530. The Muslim historians relate a romantic anecdote regarding his death. It is said that when his son, Humāyūn, fell ill, Bābur, by a fervent prayer to God, had his son's disease transferred to his own body, and thus while the son began to recover, the father's health gradually declined till he ultimately succumbed, two or three months after Humāyūn's recovery. A modern writer argues that Bābur's death was due to the attack of a disease and that "there is no reason to believe the fantasy told by 'Abul Fazl that Bābur died as the result of the sacrifice he performed for his son".[1] Bābur's body was first laid at Ārāmbāgh in Āgra, but was afterwards conveyed to Kābul, where it was buried in one of his favourite gardens.[2]

During the four years that Bābur spent in Hindustān, the Punjab, the territory covered by the modern United Provinces, and North Bihār, were conquered by him, and the leading Rājput state of Mewār also submitted to him. But he could effect nothing more than conquests, which alone do not suffice to stabilise an Empire, unless the work of administrative consolidation goes hand in hand with, or immediately follows, them. Thus, as a modern writer has remarked, "what he had left undone was of greater importance" than what he had done. Though his military conquests gave him an extensive dominion, "there was", writes Erskine, "little uniformity in the political situation of the different parts of this vast empire. Hardly any law could be regarded as universal but that of the unrestrained power of the prince. Each kingdom, each province, each district, and (we may almost say) every village, was governed, in ordinary matters, by its peculiar customs. . . . There were no regular courts of law spread over the kingdom for the administration of justice. . . . All differences relating to land, where they were not settled by the village officers, were decided by the district authorities, the collectors, the Zamindārs or Jāgīrdārs. The higher officers of government exercised not only civil but also criminal jurisdiction, even in capital cases, with little form or under little restraint". In fact, after his conquests, Bābur had hardly any time to enact new laws,

[1] Srī Rām Sharmā, "Story of Bābur's Death", *Calcutta Review*, September, 1936.

[2] As Bābur himself tells us, he had a special liking for Kābul. "The climate is extremely delightful," he writes, "and there is no such place in the known world."

or to reorganise the administration, which continued to retain its medieval feudal nature with all its defects. He could not build a sound financial system. He spent much wealth in offering presents and gifts to his followers, and remitted certain duties for the Muslims. Nor could he leave behind him any "remarkable public and philanthropic institutions" to win the goodwill of the governed. Thus, taking these defects of Bābur's work into consideration, it can very well be said that he "bequeathed to his son a monarchy which could be held together only by the continuance of war conditions, which in times of peace was weak, structureless and invertebrate". Nevertheless, he occupies an important place in the history of India, as he was the first architect to lay the foundation stone of the edifice of the Mughul Empire in India, on which the superstructure was raised by his illustrious grandson, Akbar.

Bābur is one of the most romantic and interesting personalities in the history of Asia. A man of indomitable spirit and remarkable military prowess, he was no ruthless conqueror exulting in needless massacres and wanton destruction. An affectionate father, a kind master, a generous friend and a firm believer in God, he was an ardent lover of Nature and truth and "excelled in music and other arts". He probably inherited from his father the restless spirit of adventure and geniality of temperament that he did not lose even in the most troublesome period of his life, and derived his literary tastes from his maternal grandfather. As Lane-Poole observes: "He is the link between Central Asia and India, between predatory hordes and imperial government, between Tīmūr and Akbar. The blood of the two great scourges of Asia, Chingīz and Tīmūr, mixed in his veins, and to the daring and restlessness of the nomad Tārtār he joined the culture and urbanity of the Persian. He brought the energy of the Mongol, the courage and capacity of the Turk, to the subjection of the listless Hindu; and, himself a soldier of fortune and no architect of empire, he yet laid the first stone of the splendid fabric which his grandson Akbar completed. . . . His permanent place in history rests upon his Indian conquests, which opened the way for an imperial line; but his place in biography and in literature is determined rather by his daring adventures and persevering efforts in his earlier days, and by the delightful *Memoirs* in which he related them. Soldier of fortune as he was, Bābur was not the less a man of fine literary taste and fastidious critical perception. In Persian, the language of culture, the Latin of Central Asia, as it is of India, he was an accomplished poet, and in his native Turkī he was master of a

pure and unaffected style alike in prose and verse." His *Memoirs*, which deservedly hold a high place in the history of human literature, were translated into Persian by 'Abdur Rahīm Khān-i-Khānān in the time of Akbar in 1590, into English by Leyden and Erskine in 1826, and into French in 1871. Annette Susannah Beveridge has published a revised English version of these. There is also a small collection of his fine Turkī lyrics.

2. Humāyūn and his Early Wars

Three days after the death of Bābur, Humāyūn ascended the throne of Hindustān at the age of twenty-three. The situation at his accession was not indeed a very easy one. He was confronted with several hostile forces on all sides, disguised and so the more dangerous. There was hardly any unity in the royal family, and his cousins, Muhammad Zamān and Muhammad Sultān, were pretenders to the throne. Moreover, as the law of primogeniture was not strictly enforced among the Mussalmāns, his three brothers, Kāmrān, Hindāl and 'Askarī, also coveted the throne. As Erskine remarks: "The sword was the grand arbiter of right, and every son was prepared to try his fortune against his brothers." His court was also full of nobles who engineered plans for the possession of the throne. Further, the army at his disposal was a mixed body, composed of adventurers of diverse nationalities having conflicting interests. Thus, he could not safely count on the support of his relatives, his court, or his army. Again, Bābur's legacy to Humāyūn was of a precarious nature. The former, as we have already noted, did not leave behind him a consolidated and well-organised Empire. In fact, "he had defeated the armies and broken the power of the reigning dynasty; but the only hold which he, or his race, yet had upon the people of India was military force". The Rājputs had been only temporarily subdued. Though the Afghāns had been defeated, they were far from being permanently crushed. The numerous scattered Afghān nobles, always ripe for revolt, required only a strong and able leader to galvanise them into life, and this they found in Sher Shāh. The growing power of Gujarāt under Bahādur Shāh was also a serious menace to Humāyūn.

A ruler, possessed of military genius, diplomatic skill, and political wisdom, was the need of the hour. But Humāyūn lacked all of these. In fact, he himself proved to be his worst enemy. Though endowed with intellectual tastes and love of culture, he was devoid of the wisdom and discretion, as well as strong

determination and perseverance, of his father. As Lane-Poole observes, "he was incapable of sustained effort and after a moment of triumph would bury himself in his harem and dream away the precious hours in the opium-eater's paradise whilst his enemies were thundering at the gate. Naturally kind, he forgave when he should have punished; light-hearted and sociable, he revelled at the table when he ought to have been in the saddle. His character attracts but never dominates. In private life he might have been a delightful companion and a staunch friend. But as a king he was a failure. His name means 'fortunate', and never was an unlucky sovereign more miscalled".

The first mistake on the part of Humāyūn was that he showed indiscreet clemency, probably under the dying instructions of his father, towards his brothers, who being his jealous rivals should have been kept under effective control. 'Askarī was given the fief of Sambhal; Hindāl that of Alwar; and Kāmrān, the eldest of the three, was not only confirmed in the possession of Kābul and Qandahār but also secured after a military demonstration against Mīr Yunus 'Ālī, Humāyūn's general at Lahore, the Punjab and the district of Hissār Fīrūza, to the east of the Punjab proper. Thus Humāyūn struck at the root of the integrity of Bābur's Empire. Further, the transfer of the Indus region and beyond to Kāmrān deprived Humāyūn of the best recruiting ground for his army, the strength of which was absolutely necessary for the safety of the infant Mughul dominion in India. The possession of Hissār Fīrūza gave Kāmrān the command of the high-road between the Punjab and Delhi.

Fortune, however, favoured Humāyūn in his early wars, before the hostile forces had grown uncontrollable. Five or six months after his accession he marched to besiege the fortress of Kālinjar in Bundelkhand, on the suspicion that its Rājā was in sympathy with the Afghāns. But he had to retire, after levying a certain amount of money from the Rājā, to deal with the Afghān menace in the east. He gained a decisive victory over the Afghāns at Dourah (Dauhrūā) and drove out Sultān Mahmūd Lodī from Jaunpur. He besieged Chunār, then held by the Afghān chief Sher Khān, but soon abandoned it, and without completely suppressing the rising Afghān chief accepted from him "a purely perfunctory submission", and thus allowed him free scope to develop his resources and power, while he had to march to the west to check the growing pretensions of Bahādur Shāh of Gujarāt.

Bahādur Shāh had given definite provocation to Humāyūn. He had openly given shelter and help to many of the Afghān refugees

and foes of the latter. The decline of Mewār had given him the opportunity to extend his territories at its expense, and after annexing Mālwa he besieged the famous Rājput fortress of Chitor, when Humāyūn reached Mālwa towards the end of 1534 without reaping the full advantage of his victory over the Afghāns. Severely harassed by the Gujarātīs, Rānī Karnāvatī of Mewār solicited Humāyūn's assistance against Bahādur Shāh. But the Mughul king paid no heed to this, nor did he, for his own sake, immediately attack Bahādur Shāh, but waited while the latter vanquished the Rājputs and stormed Chitor with the help of the Turkish engineer, Rūmī Khān (of Constantinople), and Portuguese and other European artillerymen. Humāyūn committed a fatal blunder by ignoring the Rājput appeal. Indeed, he lost a golden opportunity of winning for his own cause their sympathy and support, the inestimable worth of which was realised by his son, Akbar. For the present he defeated the troops of Bahādur Shāh in an engagement on the banks of an artificial lake near Mandasor, chased him from Māndū to Champāner and Ahmadābād and thence to Cambay till he was compelled to seek refuge in the island of Diu. But this victory of Humāyūn over the Gujarāt ruler was short-lived. The weakness of his character soon manifested itself here as in other events of his career. In the flush of victory, he, his brother, 'Askarī, and most of his soldiers, plunged into feasting and revelry, as a natural sequel to which "his affairs fell into confusion; and even his own camp became a scene of uproar and insubordination". The Sultān of Gujarāt took advantage of this to recover his lost territories from the Mughuls. Humāyūn could not think of subduing him again, as his attention was drawn towards the east, where the Afghāns had grown immensely powerful. No sooner had he begun his return march than Mālwa was also lost to him. Thus "one year had seen the rapid conquest of the two great provinces; the next saw them quickly lost". The next stage in Humāyūn's career was marked by his ill-fated conflicts with Sher, the champion of Afghān revival.

3. Sher Shāh and the Sūrs : The Afghān Revival and Decline

Bābur's victories at Pānīpat and Gogrā did not result in the complete annihilation of the Afghān chiefs. They were seething with discontent against the newly founded alien rule, and only needed the guidance of one strong personality to coalesce their isolated efforts into an organised national resistance against it. This they got in Sher Khān Sūr, who effected the revival of the

Afghān power and established a glorious, though short, régime in India by ousting the newly established Mughul authority.

The career of Sher Khān Sūr, the hero of Indo-Muslim revival, is as fascinating as that of Bābur and not less instructive than that of the great Mughul, Akbar. Originally bearing the name of Farid, he began his life in a humble way, and, like many other great men in history, had to pass through various trials and vicissitudes of fortune before he rose to prominence by dint of his personal merit. His grandfather, Ibrāhīm, an Afghān of the Sūr tribe, lived near Peshāwār and his father's name was Hasan. Ibrāhīm migrated with his son to the east in quest of military service in the early part of Buhlūl Lodī's reign and both first entered the service of Mahābat Khān Sūr, *jāgīrdār* of the *paraganās* of Hariana and Bakhala in the Punjab, and settled in the *paraganā* of Bājwara or Bejoura. After some time Ibrāhīm got employment under Jamāl Khān Sarang Khānī of Hissār Fīrūza in the Delhi district, who conferred upon Ibrāhīm some villages in the *paraganā* of Narnaul for the maintenance of forty horsemen in his service. Farid was born probably near Narnaul.[1] Farid was soon taken to Sasarām by his father, Hasan, who had been granted a *jāgīr* there by his master, Umar Khān Sarwānī, entitled Khān-i-A'zam, when the latter got the governorship of Jaunpur. Hasan, like the other nobles of his time, was a polygamist, and Farid's step-mother had predominant influence over him. This made him indifferent to Farid whereupon the latter left home at the age of twenty-two and went to Jaunpur. Thus the Afghān youth was forced into a life of adventure and struggle, which cast his mind and character in a heroic mould. For some time he devoted himself to study. By indefatigable industry and steady application, Farid early attracted the attention of his teachers at Jaunpur and quickly gained an uncommon acquaintance with the Persian language and literature. He was capable of reproducing from memory the *Gulistān*, *Bustān* and *Sikandar-nāmah*. Being pleased with this promising youth, Jamāl Khān, his father's patron, effected a reconciliation between him and his father, who allowed him to return to Sasarām and to administer the *paraganās* of Sasarām and Khawaspur, both then within the

[1] The old view of Dr. Qanungo that Farid was born at Hissār Fīrūza in A.D. 1486 was pointed out to be wrong by Prof. Paramatma Saran in his paper on "The Date and Place of Sher Shāh's Birth" published in *J.B.O.R.S.*, 1934, pp. 108–22. In his new edition of *Sher Shāh and His Times* (p. 10), Dr. Qanungo himself asserts, in agreement with the view of Dr. Ishwari Prasad, that Farid was born probably at Narnaul. According to Dr. Paramatma Saran, Farid was born in 1472. But Dr. Qanungo maintains the "hypothetical date of 1486" as the year of Farid's birth in the new edition of his *Sher Shāh and His Times* p. 24.

jurisdiction of Sarkar. The successful administration of those two places by Farid served to increase his step-mother's jealousy, and so leaving Sasarām once again he went to Āgra.

On the death of his father, Farid took possession of his paternal *jāgīr* on the strength of a royal *firman*, which he had been able to procure at Āgra. In 1522 he got into the service of Bahar Khān Lohānī, the independent ruler of Bihār, whose favour he soon secured by discharging his duties honestly and assiduously. His master conferred on him the title of Sher Khān for his having shown gallantry by killing a tiger single-handed, and also soon rewarded his ability and faithfulness by appointing him his deputy (*Vakil*) and tutor (*Atāliq*) of his minor son, Jalāl Khān.

But perverse destiny again went against Sher. His enemies poisoned his master's mind against him, and he was once more deprived of his father's *jāgīr*. "Impressed by the complete success of Mughul arms" and with the prospect of future gain, he now joined Bābur's camp, where he remained from April, 1527, to June, 1528. In return for the valuable services he rendered to Bābur in his eastern campaigns, the latter restored Sasarām to him.

Sher soon left the Mughul service and came back to Bihār to become again its deputy governor and guardian of his former pupil, Jalāl Khān. While the minor king remained as the nominal ruler of Bihār, Sher became the virtual head of its government. In the course of four years he won over the greater part of the army to his cause and "elevated himself to a state of complete independence". Meanwhile, the fortress of Chunār luckily came into his possession. Tāj Khān, the Lord of Chunār, was killed by his eldest son, who had risen against his father for his infatuation with a younger wife, Lad Mālikā. This widow, however, married Sher Khān and gave him the fortress of Chunār. Humāyūn besieged Chunār in 1531, but Sher Khān had taken no part in the Afghān rising of that year and saved his position by a timely submission to the Mughul invader.

The rapid and unexpected rise of Sher at the expense of the Lohānī Afghāns made the latter, and even Jalāl Khān, impatient of his control. They tried to get rid of this dictator. The attempt, however, failed owing to his "unusual circumspection". They then entered into an alliance (September, 1533) with Mahmūd Shāh, the King of Bengal, who was naturally eager to check the rise of Sher, which prejudiced his own prestige and power. But the brave Afghān deputy inflicted a defeat on the allied troops of the Bengal Sultān and the Lohānīs at Surajgarh, on the banks of the

Kiul river, east of the town of Bihār (1534). The victory at Surajgarh was indeed a turning-point in the career of Sher. "Great as it was as a military achievement, it was greater in its far-reaching political result. . . . But for the victory at Surajgarh, the *jāgīrdār* of Sasarām would never have emerged from his obscurity into the arena of politics to run, in spite of himself, a race for the Empire with hereditary crowned heads like Bahādur Shāh and Humāyūn Pādshāh." It made him the undisputed ruler of Bihār in fact as well as in name.

Sher had an opportunity to increase his power when Humāyūn marched against Bahādur Shāh of Gujarāt. He suddenly invaded Bengal and appeared before its capital, Gaur, not by the usual route through the Teliāgarhī passes (near modern Sāhebganj on the E.I. Ry. Loop Line), but by another unfrequented and less circuitous one. Mahmūd Shāh, the weak ruler of Bengal, without making any serious attempt to oppose the Afghān invader, concluded peace with him by paying him a large sum, amounting to thirteen lacs of gold pieces, and by ceding to him a territory extending from Kiul to Sakrigalī, ninety miles in length with a breadth of thirty miles. These fresh acquisitions considerably enhanced Sher's power and prestige, and, after the expulsion of Bahādur Shāh of Gujarāt to Diu, many of the distinguished Afghān nobles joined their rising leader in the east. Thus strengthened, Sher again invaded Bengal about the middle of October, 1537, with a view to conquering it permanently, and closely besieged the city of Gaur. Humāyūn, who on his way back from Gujarāt and Mālwa had been wasting his time at Āgra, in his usual fashion, realised the gravity of the Afghān menace in the east rather too late and marched to oppose Sher Khān in the second week of December, 1537. But instead of proceeding straight to Gaur, by which he could have frustrated the designs of Sher Khān in alliance with the Sultān of Bengal, he besieged Chunār. The brave garrison of Sher Khān at Chunār baffled all the attempts of the assailants for six months, while Sher Khān was left free to utilise that time for the reduction of Gaur by April, 1538. Sher Khān had also captured the fortress of Rohtās by questionable means and had sent his family and wealth there. Baffled in Bihār, Humāyūn turned towards Bengal and entered Gaur in July, 1538. But Sher Khān, cleverly avoiding any open contest with him in Bengal, went to occupy the Mughul territories in Bihār and Jaunpur and plunder the tract as far west as Kanauj.

Humāyūn, who was then whiling away his time in idleness and festivities at Gaur, was disconcerted on hearing of Sher's

activities in the west and left Bengal for Āgra before his return should be cut off. But he was opposed on the way, at Chaunsa near Buxar, by Sher Khān and his Afghān followers and suffered a heavy defeat in June, 1539. Most of the Mughul soldiers were drowned or captured; and the life of their unlucky ruler was saved by a water-carrier, who carried him on his water-skin across the Ganges, into which he had recklessly jumped.

The victory over the sovereign of Delhi widened the limit of Sher Khān's ambition and made him the *de facto* ruler of the territories extending from Kanauj in the west to the hills of Assam and Chittagong in the east and from the Himālayas in the north to the hills of Jhārkhand (from Rohtās to Bīrbhūm) and the Bay of Bengal in the south. To legalise what he had gained by the strength of arms and strategy, he now assumed the royal title of Sher Shāh and ordered the *Khutba* to be read and the coins to be struck in his name. Next year Humāyūn made another attempt to recover his fortune, though he could not secure the co-operation of his brothers in spite of his best attempts. On the 17th May, 1540, the Mughuls and the Afghāns met again opposite Kanauj. The army of Humāyūn, hopelessly demoralised, half-hearted and badly officered, was severely defeated by the Afghāns at the battle of the Ganges or Bilgrām, commonly known as the battle of Kanauj, and Humāyūn just managed to escape. Thus the work of Bābur in India was undone, and the sovereignty of Hindustān once more passed to the Afghāns. From this time Humāyūn had to lead the life of a wanderer for about fifteen years.

The sons of Bābur failed to combine even at such a critical moment, though Humāyūn went to Lahore and did his best to win them over. Their selfishness triumphed over common interests and Sher Shāh was able to extend his authority to the Punjab also. The Afghān ruler marched, with his usual promptitude and vigour, to subdue the warlike hill tribes of the Gakkar country, situated between the upper courses of the Indus and the Jhelum. He ravaged this territory but could not thoroughly reduce the Gakkars, as he had to proceed hurriedly to Bengal in March, 1541, where his deputy had imprudently rebelled against his authority. He dismissed the rebel, "changed the military character of the provincial administration and substituted a completely new mechanism, at once original in principle and efficient in working". The province was divided into several districts, each of which was to be governed by an officer appointed directly by him and responsible to him alone.

Sher Shāh next turned his attention against the Rājputs of the

west, who had not yet recovered fully from the blow of Khānua. Having subjugated Mālwa in A.D. 1542, he marched against Pūran Mal of Rāisin in Central India. After some resistance the garrison of the fort of Rāisin capitulated, the Rājputs agreeing to evacuate the fort on condition that they were allowed to pass "unmolested" beyond the frontier of Mālwa. But the Afghāns fell furiously on the people of the fort as soon as the latter had come outside the walls. To save their wives and children from disgrace, the Rājputs took their lives, and themselves died to a man, fighting bravely against their formidable foe, in 1543. The Rāisin incident has been condemned by several writers as a great blot on the character of Sher Shāh. Sind and Multān were annexed to the Afghān Empire by the governor of the Punjab. There remained only one more formidable enemy of Sher Shāh to be subdued. He was Māldev, the Rājput ruler of Mārwār, a consummate general and energetic ruler, whose territories extended over about 10,000 square miles. Instigated by some disaffected Rājput chiefs whose territories had been conquered by Māldev, Sher Khān led an expedition against the Rāthor chief in A.D. 1544. Māldev, on his part, was not unprepared. Considering it inadvisable to risk an open battle with the Rāthors in their own country, Sher Shāh had recourse to a stratagem. He sent to Māldev a few forged letters, said to have been written to him by the Rājput generals, promising him their help, and thus succeeded in frightening the Rāthor ruler, who retreated from the field and took refuge in the fortress of Sivan. In spite of this, the generals of the Rājput army, like Jeta and Kama, with their followers, opposed Sher Shāh's army and fought with desperate valour, but only to meet a warrior's death. Sher Shāh won a victory, though at great cost, with the loss of several thousand Afghāns on the battlefield and coming near to losing his empire. The Rājputs lost a chance of revival and the path was left open for undisputed Afghān supremacy over Northern India. After this success, Sher Shāh reduced to submission the whole region from Ajmer to Ābū and marched to besiege the fort of Kālinjar. He succeeded in capturing the fort, but died from an accidental explosion of gunpowder on the 22nd May, 1545.

A brave warrior and a successful conqueror, Sher Shāh was the architect of a brilliant administrative system, which elicited admiration even from eulogists of his enemies, the Mughuls. In fact, his qualities as a ruler were more remarkable than his victories on the field of battle. His brief reign of five years was marked by the introduction of wise and salutary changes in every conceivable branch of administration. Some of these were

by way of revival and reformation of the traditional features of the old administrative systems of India, Hindu as well as Muslim, while others were entirely original in character, and form, indeed, a link between ancient and modern India. "No government—not even the British," affirms Mr. Keene, "has shown so much wisdom as this Pathān." Though Sher Shāh's government was a highly centralised system, crowned by a bureaucracy, with real power concentrated in the hands of the King, he was not an unbridled autocrat, regardless of the rights and interests of the people. In the spirit of an enlightened despot, he "attempted to found an empire broadly based upon the people's will".

For convenience of administration, the whole Empire was divided into forty-seven units (*sarkārs*), each of which was again subdivided into several *paraganās*. The *paraganā* had one *Amīn*, one *Shiqdār*, one treasurer, one Hindu writer and one Persian writer to keep accounts. Over the next higher administrative unit, the *sarkār*, were placed a *Shiqdār-i-Shiqdārān* and a *Munsif-i-Munsifān* to supervise the work of the *paraganā* officers. To check undue influence of the officers in their respective jurisdictions, the King devised the plan of transferring them every two or three years, which, however, could not be long-enduring owing to the brief span of his rule. Every branch of the administration was subject to Sher Shāh's personal supervision. Like Aśoka and Harsha, he acted up to the maxim that "it behoves the great to be always active".

Sher Shāh's land revenue reforms, based on wise and humane principles, have unique importance in the administrative history of India; for they served as the model for future agrarian systems. After a careful and proper survey of the lands, he settled the land revenue direct with the cultivators, the State demand being fixed at one-fourth or one-third of the average produce, payable either in kind or in cash, the latter method being preferred. For actual collection of revenue the Government utilised the services of officers like the *Amīns*, the *Maqadams*, the *Shiqdārs*, the *Qānūngos* and the *Patwārīs*. Punctual and full payment of the assessed amount was insisted on and enforced, if necessary, by Sher Shāh. He instructed the revenue officials to show leniency at the time of assessment and to be strict at the time of collection of revenues. The rights of the tenants were duly recognised and the liabilities of each were clearly defined in the *kabuliyat* (deed of agreement), which the State took from him, and the *paṭṭā* (title-deed), which it gave him in return. Remissions of rents were made, and probably loans were advanced to the tenants in case of damage to crops,

caused by the encampment of soldiers, or the insufficiency of rain. These revenue reforms increased the resources of the State and at the same time conduced to the interest of the people.

The currency and tariff reforms of Sher Shāh were also calculated to improve the general economic condition of his Empire. He not only introduced some specific changes in the mint but also tried to rectify "the progressive deterioration of the previous Kings". He reformed the tariff by removing vexatious customs and permitting the imposition of customs on articles of trade only at the frontiers and in the places of sale. This considerably helped the cause of trade and commerce by facilitating easy and cheap transport of merchandise.

This was further helped by the improvement of communications. For the purpose of imperial defence, as well as for the convenience of the people, Sher Shāh connected the important places of his kingdom by a chain of excellent roads. The longest of these, the Grand Trunk Road, which still survives, extended for 1,500 *kos* from Sonārgāon in Eastern Bengal to the Indus. One road ran from Āgra to Burhānpur, another from Āgra to Jodhpur and the fort of Chitor, and a fourth from Lahore to Multān. Following the traditions of some rulers of the past, Sher Shāh planted shade-giving trees on both sides of the established roads, and *sarāis* or rest-houses at different stages, separate arrangements being provided for the Muslims and the Hindus. These *sarāis* also served the purpose of post-houses, which facilitated quick exchange of news and supplied the Government with information from different parts of the Empire. The maintenance of an efficient system of espionage also enabled the ruler to know what happened in his kingdom.

To secure peace and order, the police system was reorganised, and the principle of local responsibility for local crimes was enforced. Thus the village headmen were made responsible for the detection of criminals, and maintenance of peace, in the rural areas. The efficiency of the system has been testified to by all the Muslim writers. "Such was the state of safety of the highway," observes Nizām-ud-dīn, who had no reason to be partial towards Sher Shāh, "that if any one carried a purse full of gold (pieces) and slept in the desert (deserted places) for nights, there was no need for keeping watch."

Sher Shāh had a strong sense of justice, and its administration under him was even-handed, no distinction being made between the high and the low, and not even the near relatives of the King being spared from its decrees. In the *paraganā*, civil suits were

disposed of by the *Amīn*, and other cases, mostly criminal, by the *Qāzī* and the *Mīr-i-Adal*. Several *paraganās* had over them a *Munsif-i-Munsifān* to try civil cases. At the capital city there were the Chief *Qāzī*, the imperial *Sadr*, and above all, the Emperor as the highest authority in judicial as in other matters.

Though a pious Muslim, Sher Shāh was not a fierce bigot.[1] His treatment of the Hindus in general was tolerant and just. He employed Hindus in important offices of the State, one of his best generals being Brahmajit Gaur. "His attitude towards Hinduism," observes Dr. Qanungo, "was not of contemptuous sufferance but of respectful deference; it received due recognition in the State."

Sher Shāh realised the importance of maintaining a strong and efficient army, and so reorganised it, borrowing largely the main principles of 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī's military system. The services of a body of armed retainers, or of a feudal levy, were not considered sufficient for his needs; he took care to maintain a regular army, the soldiers being bound to him, through their immediate commanding officer, by the strong tie of personal devotion and discipline. He had under his direct command a large force consisting of 150,000 cavalry, 25,000 infantry, 300 elephants and artillery. Garrisons were maintained at different strategic points of the kingdom; each of these, called a *fauj*, was under the command of a *faujdār*. Sher Shāh enforced strict discipline in the army and took ample precautions to prevent corruption among the soldiers. Besides duly supervising the recruitment of soldiers, he personally fixed their salaries, took their descriptive rolls and revived the practice of branding horses.

Sher Shāh is indeed a striking personality in the history of Medieval India. By virtue of sheer merit and ability he rose from a very humble position to be the leader of Afghān revival, and one of the greatest rulers that India has produced. His "military character" was marked by "a rare combination of caution and enterprise"; his political conduct was, on the whole, just and humane; his religious attitude was free from medieval bigotry; and his excellent taste in building is well attested, even to-day, by his noble mausoleum at Sasarām. He applied his indefatigable industry to the service of the State, and his reforms were well calculated to secure the interests of the people. He had, remarks Erskine, "more of the spirit of a legislator and a guardian of

[1] It does not seem to be fair to describe Sher Shāh's religious policy as "narrow" as a modern writer has done. *Vide I.H.Q.*, December, 1936, pp 600–1.

his people than any prince before Akbar". In fact, the real significance of his reign lies in the fact that he embodied in himself those very qualities which are needed for the building of a national State in India, and he prepared the ground for the glorious Akbaride régime in more ways than one. But for his accidental death after only five years' rule, the restoration of the Mughuls would not have been accomplished so soon. As Smith observes: "If Sher Shāh had been spared, the 'Great Moghuls' would not have appeared on the stage of history." His right to the throne of India was better than that of Humāyūn. While Humāyūn had inherited the conquests of a Central Asian adventurer, who had not been able to create any strong claim, except that of force, for the rule of his dynasty in India, Sher Shāh's family, hailing from the frontier, had lived within India for three generations. Further, the latter's equipment for kingship was exceptionally high, and he had achieved a good deal more than the mere conquest of territories.

4. The Successors of Sher Shāh

The Afghān Empire built up by Sher Shāh did not long survive his death. The disappearance of his strong personality, and the weakness of his successors, led to the recrudescence of jealousies and refractoriness among the Afghān nobles, which plunged the whole kingdom into a welter of anarchy and thus paved the way for Mughul restoration. On Sher Shāh's death, his second son, Jalāl Khān, who was then at Rewah, was proclaimed king under the title of Sultān Islām Shāh, commonly known as Salīm Shāh. Salīm strengthened his position against the intrigues of his brother and his supporters, by drastic measures. He maintained the efficiency of the army and most of his father's wise reforms. "His internal administration was excellent." But he died young in November, 1554, and disorders soon followed. His minor son, Fīrūz Khān, was murdered by his maternal uncle, Mubāriz Khān (son of Nizām Khān Sūr, Sher Shāh's brother, and brother of Fīrūz Khān's mother, Bibi Bāi), who seized the throne and assumed the title of Muhammad 'Ādil Shāh. 'Ādil Shāh being an indolent and worthless prince, Hīmū, a purely self made man, who rose from the position of an ordinary Beniā of Rewārī in Mewāt to that of the chief minister of the Sūr monarch, tried to manage the affairs of the kingdom with tact; but the suspicious nature, and the follies, of his master frustrated his efforts with great prejudice to the interests of the decaying Afghān Empire. 'Ādil Shāh soon afterwards lost Bengal and Mālwa; his own

relatives rebelled against him; and his authority was also challenged by two nephews of Sher Shāh, who asserted their claims to the throne.

5. Restoration of the Mughuls

This disturbed situation encouraged Humāyūn to attempt the restoration of his lost dominion after about fifteen years. He had been wandering from place to place in search of shelter and help. So intense was the jealousy of his brothers, especially of Kāmrān, that they showed him great unkindness even in these days of adversity, not to speak of their pooling their resources against the Afghāns. His attempts to find a rallying-ground in Sind also proved unsuccessful, because of the hostility of Shāh Husain, the governor of Sind; and the scarcity of provisions among his followers, whose numbers had been swelled by the influx of many fugitives. It was during his wanderings in the deserts of Sind that early in 1542 he married Hamīda Bānu Begam, daughter of Shaikh 'Ālī Ambar Jaini, who had been a preceptor to Humāyūn's brother Hindāl. The Rājput princes dared not afford him shelter. He went to Amarkot, the Hindu chief of which, Rānā Prasād by name, had promised help to conquer Thatta and Bhakkar, but he disappointed him in the end. It was here that his son Akbar was born on the 23rd November, 1542. Bhakkar could not be conquered by Humāyūn, who failed also to secure asylum with his brother Kāmrān. Thus driven from pillar to post, Humāyūn left India and threw himself on the generosity of Shāh Tahmāsp. The young ruler of Persia helped him with a force of 14,000 men on his promising to conform to the Shiah creed, to have the Shāh's name proclaimed in his *Khutba* and to cede Qandahār to him on his success. Thus Persian help, which had once facilitated the success of Bābur's eastern enterprise, now enabled his successor to recover his lost dominion. With it Humāyūn occupied Qandahār and Kābul in 1545. But Qandahār was not given to the Persians, and it proved henceforth to be a bone of contention between them and the Mughuls. Kāmrān was imprisoned, blinded and sent to Mecca, to which Humāyūn consented with the utmost reluctance, though his brother merited no lenient treatment in view of his past conduct. 'Askarī also proceeded to Mecca, but Hindāl fell dead in a night encounter.

Having overcome the hostility of his unkind brothers in the north-west, Humāyūn marched in November, 1554, to reconquer Hindustān, for which he got an excellent opportunity in the civil wars among the Sūrs. In February, 1555, he captured Lahore. After

defeating Sikandar Sūr, the rebel governor of the Punjab, who had been proclaimed Emperor by the Afghāns, in a battle near Sirhind, he occupied Delhi and Āgra in the month of July of the same year. Sikandar retired to the Siwālik Hills. Thus by a favourable turn of fortune, Humāyūn succeeded in recovering a part of what he had lost through his own weakness and indecision. But he did not live long enough to show if adversity had produced any wholesome effect on his character. He died on the 24th January, 1556, in consequence of an accidental fall from the staircase of his library at Delhi.

Akbar, who was then in the Punjab with his guardian Bairam, an old comrade of his father, was formally proclaimed on the 14th February, 1556, at the age of thirteen, as the successor of Humāyūn. But the Mughul supremacy over Hindustān was still far from being assured. As Smith writes, "before Akbar could become Pādshāh in reality as well as in name he had to prove himself better than the rival claimants to the throne, and at least to win back his father's lost dominion". As a matter of fact, India in 1556 "presented a dark as well as a complex picture". While the country had ceased to enjoy the benefits of the reforms of Sher Shāh through the follies and quarrels of his successors, it was subjected at the same time to the horrors of a terrible famine. Further, each of the independent kingdoms in different parts of India was contending for power. In the north-west, Mīrzā Muhammad Hakīm, Akbar's half-brother, governed Kābul almost independently. In the north Kāshmīr was under a local Muhammadan dynasty and the Himālayan States were also independent. Sind and Multān had become free from imperial control after the death of Sher Shāh. Orissa, Mālwa and Gujarāt and the local chieftains of Gondwāna (in the modern Central Provinces) were independent of the control of any overlord. South of the Vindhyas lay the extensive Vijayanagar Empire, and the Muslim Sultānates of Khāndesh, Berar, Bīdar, Ahmadnagar, and Golkundā which felt little or no interest in northern politics. The Portuguese had established their influence on the western coast by the possession of Goa and Diu. Humāyūn had been able to recover only a small fragment of his territories in Hindustān before he died. The Sūrs were still in occupation of the greater portion of Sher Shāh's dominion. As Ahmad Yadgar tells us, "the country from Āgra to Mālwa, and the confines of Jaunpur, owned the sovereignty of 'Ādil Shāh: from Delhi to the smaller Rohtās on the road to Kābul it was in the hands of Shāh Sikandar; and from the borders of the hills to the boundaries of Gujarāt, it belonged to Ibrāhim Khān". As for the claims to the lordship of Hindustān, there

was nothing to choose between Akbar and the representatives of Sher. These "could be decided", as Smith writes, "only by the sword". Thus Akbar's heritage was of a precarious nature, and his task of building up an Empire was indeed a very difficult one.

Soon after Akbar's accession, Hīmū, the capable general and minister of 'Ādil Shāh Sūr, came forward to oppose the Mughuls. He first occupied Āgra and Delhi by defeating Tārdī Beg, the Mughul governor of Delhi, who was put to death under the orders of Bairam for his failure to defend Delhi. Having assumed the title of Rājā Vikramjit or Vikramāditya, Hīmū met Akbar and Bairam at the historic field of Pānīpat with a large army including 1,500 war elephants. He had initial successes against both the wings of the Mughul army, but the day was decided by a chance arrow which struck him in the eye. He lost consciousness, and his soldiers, deprived of their leader, dispersed in confusion. In this helpless condition, Hīmū was put to death, according to some, by Bairam, on the refusal of Akbar to kill him with his own hands, and, according to others, by Akbar himself at the instigation of his Protector.

The result of the second battle of Pānīpat was decisive. It brought to a close the Afghān-Mughul contest for supremacy in India by giving a verdict in favour of the latter. The victors soon occupied Delhi and Āgra. Sikandar Sūr surrendered himself to them in May, A.D. 1557, and was granted a fief in the eastern provinces, whence he was soon expelled by Akbar and died as a fugitive in Bengal (A.D. 1558–1559). Muhammad 'Ādil died (1556) fighting at Monghyr against the governor of Bengal. Ibrāhīm Sūr, after wandering from place to place, found asylum in Orissa, where he was killed about ten years later (A.D. 1567–1568). Thus there remained no Sūr rival to contest Akbar's claims to sovereignty over Hindustān. The later anti-Mughul Afghān risings, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, were more or less too sporadic and local to be a serious menace to Mughul suzerainty.

CHAPTER II

AKBAR THE GREAT

1. End of the Regency

THE second battle of Pānīpat marked the real beginning of the Mughul Empire in India and set it on the path of expansion. Between 1558 and 1560 Gwālior, Ajmer and Jaunpur were incorporated into it. But Akbar, held in the trammels of tutelage by his guardian and Protector, Bairam Khān, was not yet free to act independently. The Protector had rendered valuable services to the Mughuls, but he had created many enemies by this time by using his power in a high-handed manner. Abul Fazl writes that "at length Bairam's proceedings went beyond all endurance". Akbar personally felt a desire to be king in fact as well as in name, and was also urged by his mother, Hamīda Bānu Begam, his foster-mother, Māham Anaga, and her son, Ādam Khān, to get rid of the regent. In 1560 the Emperor openly expressed before Bairam his determination to take the reins of government in his own hands and dismissed him. The Protector submitted to the decision of his master with apparent resignation and agreed to leave for Mecca. But when Akbar deputed Pīr Muhammad, a personal enemy and former subordinate of Bairam, to see his guardian out of the imperial domains, or as Badāūnī puts it, "to pack him off as quickly as possible to Mecca", the latter, considering it to be an insult, rebelled. He was defeated near Jullundur, but Akbar was wise enough to treat him with generosity in consideration of his past services. On his way to Mecca, Bairam was stabbed to death in January, 1561, by a Lohānī Afghān, whose father had been killed on a previous occasion by the Mughul troops under the command of the Protector. Though the Afghāns plundered all that he had been carrying with him, his family escaped disgrace and his son, 'Abdur Rahīm, received Akbar's protection and rose later on to be one of the chief nobles of the Empire.

The fall of Bairam did not at once enable Akbar to assume fully the reins of government into his own hands. For two years more (A.D. 1560–1562), his foster-mother, Māham Anaga, her son, Ādam

Khān, and their relatives, exercised an undue influence in the State. Ādam Khān and Pīr Muhammad effected the conquest of Mālwa (1561) by methods which have been vividly described by Badāūnī, an eye-witness of their oppression; but they remained unpunished. Being at last impatient of their influence, Akbar caused the death of Ādam Khān. His mother died of grief after forty days. Thus by the month of May, 1562, Akbar was able to emancipate himself from harem influence.

2. Conquests and Annexations

A strong imperialist by instinct, Akbar followed a policy of conquest for the expansion of his empire until the capture of Asīrgarh in January, 1601. Unforeseen and uncontrollable circumstances prevented him from carrying it further. "A monarch", he held, "should be ever intent on conquest, otherwise his neighbours rise in arms against him." In fact, Akbar achieved the political unification of nearly the whole of Northern and Central India by frequent annexations extending over forty years. We have already noted how Mālwa was conquered by Ādam Khān and Pīr Muhammad in 1561, but its ruler, Bāz Bahādur, soon recovered it and did not submit to the Mughuls until some years later. In 1564 Akbar sent Āsaf Khān, governor of Karā and the eastern provinces, to conquer the kingdom of Garah Katanga (in Gondwāna), roughly corresponding to the northern districts of the Central Provinces. The reigning king of this tract, Bīr Nārāyan, was a minor, but it was ably governed by his mother, Durgāvatī, a Rājput lady of superb beauty and great valour. She gallantly opposed the imperialists but was defeated in a fight with them between Garah and Mandala (now in the Jubbulpore district). In the true Rājput spirit, she preferred death to disgrace and committed suicide. Thus "her end was as noble and devoted as her life had been useful". The young ruler, Bīr Nārāyan, fought in a chivalrous manner against his enemies till he lost his life. The invaders captured a vast booty. Āsaf Khān held the kingdom for some time, but it was subsequently made over to a representative of the old ruling family, who was compelled by the Mughuls to "part with that portion of his kingdom which now forms the kingdom of Bhopāl".

As we have already noted, the battle of Khānua (1527) did not result in the total eclipse of Rājput influence in the north. Rājputāna still formed a powerful factor in the history of India. Gifted with the true insight of a statesman and liberal in outlook, Akbar realised the value of Rājput alliance in his task of building up an Empire in

India for his dynasty, which was a foreign one, at the cost of the Afghāns, who were the "children of the soil". Thus he tried, as far as possible, to conciliate the Rājputs and secure and ensure their active co-operation in almost all his activities. By his wise and liberal policy, he won the hearts of most of them to such an extent that they rendered valuable services to his empire and even shed their blood for it. The Empire of Akbar was, in fact, the outcome of the co-ordination of Mughul prowess and diplomacy and Rājput valour and service. In 1562, Rājā Bihārī Mall, of Amber (Jaipur), tendered his submission to Akbar and cemented his friendship with him by a marriage alliance. Bihārī Mall, with his son, Bhagwān Dās, and grandson, Mān Singh, proceeded to Āgra. He was given a command of 5,000 and his son and grandson were also admitted to high rank in the army. Thus was opened the way through which the Mughul Emperors were able to secure for four generations "the services of some of the greatest captains and diplomats that medieval India produced".

But Mewār, where the Rājput spirit had manifested itself "in its very quintessence", which had been provided with excellent means of defence in its steep mountains and strong castles, and which had contested with Bābur the supremacy of Northern India, did not bow its head in obedience to the Mughul Emperor. It offended him by giving shelter to Bāz Bahādur, the fugitive ruler of Mālwa. Its independence was, however, galling to Akbar, who cherished the ideal of an all-India empire, the economic interests of which also demanded a control over Mewār, through which lay the highways of commerce between the Ganges–Jumnā Doāb and the western coast. The ambitious design of Akbar was facilitated by the prevalence of internal discord in Mewār, following the death of Rānā Sanga, and by the weakness of Udai Singh, the unworthy son of a noble sire. "Well had it been for Mewār," exclaims Tod, "had the annals of Mewār never recorded the name of Udai Singh in the catalogue of her princes." When Akbar besieged the fort of Chitor in October, 1567, Udai Singh fled to the hills, leaving his capital to its fate. But there were some brave followers of the Rānā, notably Jaimall and Patta, who offered a stubborn opposition to the imperialists for four months (20th October, 1567, to 23rd February, 1568) till Jaimall was killed by a musket-shot fired by Akbar himself. Patta also fell dead later. The death of the leaders of the defence disheartened the besieged garrison, who rushed on their enemies sword in hand and fought bravely till they perished to a man. The Rājput women performed the rite of *Jauhar*. Akbar then stormed the fort of Chitor. According to

Abul Fazl 30,000 persons were slain, but the figure seems to be highly exaggerated. Akbar's wrath fell also upon what Tod calls "the symbols of regality". Thus he removed the huge kettledrums (eight or ten feet in diameter, the reverberation of which proclaimed for miles around the entrance and exit of the princes from the gates of Chitor) and also the massive candelabra from the shrine of the Great Mother of Chitor, to Āgra.

Struck with terror at the fall of Chitor, the other Rājput chiefs, who had so long defied Akbar, submitted to him. In February, 1569, Rāi Surjana Hara of Ranthambhor surrendered to Akbar the keys of his fortress and entered into the imperial service. Rājā Rāmchānd, the chief of Kālinjar in Bundelkhand, followed suit in the same year. The occupation of Kālinjar greatly strengthened Akbar's military position and marks an important step in the progress of Mughul imperialism. In 1570 the rulers of Bikāner and Jaisalmer not only submitted to the Mughul Emperor but also gave their daughters in marriage to him.

Thus, one by one, the Rājput chiefs acknowledged Mughul sway, but Mewār still refused to own it. Udai Singh retained his independence though he had lost his ancestral capital. After his death on the 3rd March, 1572, at Gogundā, situated about nineteen miles north-west of Udaipur, Mewār found a true patriot and leader in his son Pratāp, who, being in every respect faithful to the traditions of his country, offered uncompromising resistance to the invaders. The magnitude of his task can be well understood when we note that without a capital, and with only slender resources, he had to oppose the organised strength of the Mughul Emperor, who was then "immeasurably the richest monarch on the face of the earth". Further, his fellow chiefs and neighbours and even his own brother, devoid of the high Rājput ideals of chivalry and independence, had allied themselves with the Mughuls. But no obstacle was too alarming for this national hero of Rājputāna, who was made of nobler stuff than his relatives. "The magnitude of the peril confirmed the fortitude of Pratāp, who vowed, in the words of the bard, 'to make his mother's milk resplendent,' and he amply redeemed his pledge." The inevitable imperial invasion of his territory took place in April, 1576, under a body of troops commanded by Mān Singh of Amber and Āsaf Khān, and a furious battle was fought at the pass of Haldighāt near Gogundā. Pratāp was defeated, and barely escaped with his life, which was saved by the selfless devotion of the chief of Jhāla, who drew upon himself the attack of the imperialists by declaring himself to be the Rānā. Mounted on his

beloved horse "*Chaitak*", the Rānā betook himself to the hills, and his strongholds were captured by his enemies one by one. But Pratāp could not think of submission even in the midst of the direst adversity. Hunted from rock to rock by his implacable enemy, and "feeding his family from the fruits of his native hills", he continued the war with undaunted spirit and energy and had the satisfaction of recovering many of his strongholds before he died on the 19th January, 1597, at the age of fifty-seven. The Rājput patriot was anxious for his motherland even at his last moment, for he had no faith in his son; and before he expired, he exacted from his chiefs "a pledge that his country should not be abandoned to the Turks". "Thus closed the life of a Rājput whose memory," observes Tod, "is even now idolized by every Sisodiā." "Had Mewār," he adds, "possessed her Thucydides or her Xenophon, neither the wars of the Peloponnesus nor the retreat of the 'Ten Thousand' would have yielded more diversified incidents for the historic muse than the deeds of this brilliant reign amid the many vicissitudes of Mewār. Undaunted heroism, inflexible fortitude, that sincerity which 'keeps honour bright', perseverance—with fidelity such as no nation can boast of, were the materials opposed to a soaring ambition, commanding talents, unlimited means, and the fervour of religious zeal; all, however, insufficient to contend with one unconquerable mind." Pratāp's is indeed an inspiring personality in Indian history. The Rājputs have produced abler generals and more astute statesmen than Pratāp, but not more brave and noble patriotic leaders than he. Pratāp's son, Amar Singh, tried to carry out the behest of his father but was attacked by a Mughul army under Mān Singh in 1599 and was defeated after a gallant resistance. Akbar could not undertake any other invasion of Mewār owing to illness.

After annexing Ranthambhor and Kālinjar in A.D. 1569, the Mughuls subjugated Gujarāt. With rich and flourishing ports on its coasts, Gujarāt had an attractive commercial position and a special economic advantage. Its possession had therefore been coveted by the preceding rulers of Delhi, even by Humāyūn, whose occupation of it was, however, temporary. But Akbar must have realised the importance of occupying this province for the interests of his Empire, and the prevailing distracted condition of Gujarāt under its nominal king, Muzaffar Shāh III, gave him an excellent opportunity for it. As a matter of fact, his intervention being sought by I'timād Khān, the leader of a local faction, had some justification. In 1572 Akbar marched in person against Gujarāt, defeated all opposition and pensioned off the puppet

king. He captured Surāt on the 26th February, 1573, after besieging it for a month and a half, and the Portuguese, who came in touch with him on this occasion, courted his friendship. But no sooner had he reached his headquarters at Fathpur Sīkrī than insurrections broke out in the newly conquered province, in which some of his own cousins took part. Highly enraged at this, Akbar marched hurriedly to Ahmadābād, having traversed six hundred miles in eleven days, and thoroughly vanquished the insurgents in a battle near Ahmadābād on the 2nd September, 1573. Gujarāt thus came under Akbar's authority and became henceforth an integral part of his Empire. It turned out to be one of its profitable sources of income, chiefly through the reorganisation of its finances and revenues by Todar Mal, whose work in that province was ably carried on by Shihāb-ud-dīn Ahmad from 1577 to 1583 or 1584. "The conquest of Gujarāt," remarks Dr. Smith, "marks an important epoch in Akbar's history." Besides placing its resources at the disposal of the Empire, it secured for it free access to the sea and brought it in contact with the Portuguese, which in some ways influenced the history of India. But the Mughuls made no attempt to build up any sea-power and their shortsightedness in this direction helped the intrusion of the European traders.

The more important province of Bengal was next conquered by the Mughuls. The Sūr kings made themselves independent in Bengal during the short and stormy reign of Muhammad 'Ādil Shāh and ruled it till 1564, when, taking advantage of the disorders following the murder of the reigning young king, Sulaimān Kararānī, governor of South Bihār, extended his authority over Bengal also. Till his death in A.D. 1572, Sulaimān formally recognised the overlordship of Akbar and maintained friendly relations with him. He transferred his capital from Gaur to Tāndā and annexed the Hindu kingdom of Orissa. But his son, Dāūd, who, according to the author of the *Tabaqāt*, "knew nothing of the art of government", soon "forsook the prudent measures of his father". He incurred the Emperor's resentment not only by proclaiming his independence but also by attacking the outpost of Zamāniā on the eastern frontier of the Empire (situated in the Ghāzīpur district of U.P.). In 1574 Akbar himself marched against the presumptuous governor of Bengal and expelled him from Patna and Hājīpur during the rainy season. He returned to Fathpur Sīkrī, leaving Mun'im Khān in charge of the Bengal campaign. Dāūd retreated towards Orissa and was defeated by the Mughul troops at Tukaroi near the eastern bank of the Suvarnarekhā on the 3rd March, 1575. But this battle had no

decisive result owing to the ill-advised leniency of Mun'im Khān towards the vanquished foe, who was consequently able to strike once more to recover Bengal in October, 1575. This necessitated another campaign against Dāūd, who was finally defeated and killed in a battle, near Rājmahal, in July, 1576. Bengal henceforth became an integral part of the Mughul Empire. But the weak policy of the imperial governor, Muzaffar Khān Turbatī, who was "harsh in his measures and offensive in his speech", gave rise to fresh troubles in that province. Further, the authority of the Emperor continued to be long resisted there by some powerful Bengal chiefs, the most important of whom were 'Isā Khān of East Central Dacca and Mymensingh, Kedār Rāi of Vikrampur, Kandarpanārāyan of Chandradvīpa (Bakarganj) and Pratāpāditya of Jessore. Orissa was finally annexed to the Empire in 1592.

In the meanwhile, Akbar had to face a critical situation due to the sinister motives of his step-brother, Mīrzā Muhammad Hakīm. who governed Kābul as an independent ruler for all practical purposes. In conspiracy with some nobles of the eastern provinces, and some discontented officers of the court, like Khwāja Mansūr, the *Diwān* of the Empire, and others, he cherished the ambition of seizing the throne of Hindustān for himself and even invaded the Punjab. Considering it inadvisable to ignore any longer his intrigues and movements, Akbar marched from his capital on the 8th February, 1581, towards Afghānistān with about 50,000 cavalry, 500 elephants and a large number of infantry. Mīrzā Muhammad Hakīm, on hearing of the Emperor's advance, fled from the Punjab to Kābul without offering any opposition to his brother. The Emperor thereupon entered Kābul on the 9th August, 1581. Mīrzā Muhammad Hakīm was defeated, but was restored to the government of his province on taking a vow of fidelity to the Emperor, who returned to Delhi early in December, 1581. The victory at Kābul brought immense relief to Akbar. It gave him, writes Smith, "an absolutely free hand for the rest of his life, and may be regarded as the climax of his career". Kābul was formally annexed to the Delhi empire after the death of Mīrzā Muhammad Hakīm in July, 1585.

3. The North-West Frontier

Every government in India has to deal with the complex north-west frontier problem. This region occupies a position of strategic as well as economic importance, and it is, therefore, highly necessary for a ruler of India to maintain effective control over it. The

Hindukush range, separating Central Asia from Southern Afghānistān, Baluchistān and India, becomes "much less forbidding" in the north of Herāt, and through this vulnerable point an external invader from Persia or Central Asia may easily enter the Kābul Valley and India. As the master of Kābul, the Mughul Emperor "must hold Qandahār or his dominion is unsafe. In an age when Kābul was a part of the Delhi Empire, Qandahār was our indispensable first line of defence". Qandahār was also an important trade centre, where merchants from different parts of Asia flocked together and exchanged their commodities. Through it goods were carried from India to other Asiatic countries more frequently than before, owing to the Portuguese domination of the Red Sea and their hostile relations with Persia. Further, the turbulent Afghān tribes of the frontier, such as the Uzbegs and the Yūsufzāis, were "very dangerous in their native hills, being democratic to a degree and fanatically attached to their liberty. Fighting in the fastnesses of their country which afford the best of natural defences, they . . . ever resisted any attempts to bring them into subjugation to any of the adjoining monarchies". Their attitude towards the Mughul Empire was far from friendly, but an imperialist like Akbar could hardly fail to realise the importance of effectively guarding this frontier. He was able to suppress the turbulence of the Uzbegs, whose leader, 'Abdullah Khān, remained friendly to the Mughul Emperor, and also to defeat the Roshniyās.[1] The Yūsufzāis, too, were crushingly defeated by a large Mughul army commanded by Rājā Todar Mall and Prince Murād. Abul Fazl writes: "A large number of them were killed and many were sold into Turān and Persia. The countries of Sawad (Swāt), Bājaur and Buner, which have few equals for climate, fruits and cheapness of food, were cleansed of the evil-doers." Bhagwān Dās and Kāsim Khān being deputed at the head of 5,000 men to conquer Kāshmīr, defeated its Sultān, Yūsuf Shāh, and his son, Ya'qūb, in 1586. Kāshmīr was then annexed to the Empire. Sind and Baluchistān were conquered in 1590–1591 and 1595 respectively. Qandahār came into the possession of Akbar peacefully. Being harassed by his own relatives and also by the Uzbegs, the Persian governor of Qandahār, Muzaffar Husain Mīrzā. surrendered it to Akbar's

[1] The Roshniyās were the followers of Bāyazīd, who "had been preaching a special form of Muhammadanism in which communism on the one hand and the destruction of the enemies of Islam on the other, seem to have been two of the leading features. Add to this his suggestion that he was the Mehdi (the Messiah) to come and we have all the elements of religious explosion". Kennedy, *History of the Great Moghuls*, p. 27.

representative, Shāh Beg, in A.D. 1595. Thus as a result of Akbar's policy in the north-west, important territories were added to his empire, its position was made secure on that frontier, and its prestige was immensely enhanced. By the year 1595 he made himself undisputed ruler of the area extending from the Himālayas to the Narmadā and from Hindukush to the Brahmaputra, with the exception of a narrow strip of tribal area beyond the Indus and a few other tracts.

4. Akbar and the Deccan

Having thus consolidated his authority over Northern and Central India, Akbar decided to extend his sovereignty to the Deccan. In this he was but following the traditional policy of earlier northern imperial governments, like those of the Mauryas, the Guptas, the Khaljīs and the Tughluqs. He had two definite objects in view. Firstly, with the ideal of an all-India Empire, he naturally sought to bring the Deccan Sultānates, Ahmadnagar, Bijāpur, Golkundā and Khāndesh, under his hegemony. Secondly, as a shrewd statesman, he wanted to utilise his control over the Deccan as a means of pushing back the Portuguese to the sea, because though his relations with them were apparently friendly, he did not think it wise to allow them to enjoy for themselves a part of the economic resources of the country and interfere in its politics. Thus Akbar's Deccan policy was purely imperialistic in origin and outlook. It was not influenced in the least by religious considerations as was the case, to a certain extent, with Shāh Jahān or Aurangzeb.

The Deccan Sultānates were not in a position to defend themselves against the onrush of Mughul imperialism, as they had almost exhausted their strength and sunk into inefficiency by indulging in quarrels among themselves after their temporary alliance against Vijayanagar in A.D. 1564–1565. Akbar first tried to extort from them a formal acknowledgment of his suzerainty over the Deccan by sending ambassadors to their respective courts in 1591. But all, except Khāndesh, returned evasive answers to his overtures. The failure of diplomatic missions led him to resort to arms. A large army under Bairam Khān's son, 'Abdur Rahīm, and the Emperor's second son, Prince Murād, was sent against Ahmadnagar, which had been weakened by internal quarrels. Though the operations of the Mughul army were much hampered, as its two generals did not pull well with each other, Ahmadnagar was besieged by it in 1595. The city was defended with splendid courage

and extraordinary resolution by Chānd Bibi, a dowager-queen of Bijāpur and daughter of Husain Nizām Shāh. The besiegers concluded a treaty with Chānd Bibi in 1596 whereby Berar was ceded to the Mughuls and the boy king of Ahmadnagar promised to recognise the overlordship of Akbar. But after the departure of the Mughuls, Chānd Bibi "resigned her authority", and a faction at Ahmadnagar, in violation of the treaty, contrary to her will and advice, renewed the war with the Mughuls in the next year with a view to expelling them from Berar. The Mughuls gained a victory over the Deccanis at Sūpa near Ashti on the Godāvarī in February, 1597. Internal dissensions prevailed in Ahmadnagar, and Chānd Bibi being either "murdered or constrained to take poison", the city was stormed without difficulty by the imperialists in August, 1600. But the kingdom was not finally annexed to the Empire till the reign of Shāh Jahān.

Miān Bahādur Shāh, a ruler of Khāndesh, refused to submit to the imperial authority. Akbar, relieved of the danger of Uzbeg invasion after the death of 'Abdullah Khān in 1598, marched to the south in July, 1599. He soon captured Burhānpur, the capital of Khāndesh, and easily laid siege to the mighty fortress of Asīrgarh, than which "it was impossible to conceive a stronger fortress, or one more amply supplied with artillery, warlike stores and provisions". The besieged garrison, though greatly weakened owing to the outbreak of a terrible pestilence which swept off many of them, defended the fortress for six months, when Akbar hastened to achieve his end by subtle means. Unwilling to prolong the siege as his son Salīm had rebelled against him, the Emperor inveigled Miān Bahādur Shāh into his camp to negotiate for a treaty, on promise of personal safety, but detained him there and forced him to write a letter to the garrison with instructions to surrender the fort. The garrison, however, still held out. Akbar next seduced the Khāndesh officers by lavish distribution of money among them, and thus the gates of Asīrgarh "were opened by golden keys". This was the last conquest of Akbar.

Having organised the newly-conquered territories into three *subahs* of Ahmadnagar, Berar and Khāndesh, and appointed Prince Dāniyāl viceroy of Southern and Western India, that is to say, of the three Deccan *subahs* with Mālwa and Gujarāt, Akbar returned to Āgra in May, 1601, to deal with the rebellious Salīm. The Deccan campaigns of Akbar resulted in pushing the Mughul frontier from the Narmadā to the upper courses of the Kṛishnā river (called here the Bhīmā). But "the annexation was in form only. The new territory was too large to be effectively governed

or even fully conquered. Everywhere, especially in the south and the west, local officers of the old dynasty refused to obey the conqueror, or began to set up puppet princes as a screen for their self-assertion. The Sultāns of Bijāpur and Golkundā seized the adjacent districts of their fallen neighbours".

5. The Last Days of Akbar

The last days of Akbar were rendered unhappy by grief and anguish. His beloved friend and poet, Faizī, passed away in 1595. In eagerness to seize the throne, Salīm set himself up as an independent king at Allahābād and entered into intrigues with the Portuguese to achieve his end. In 1602 he further wounded his father's feelings by causing Abul Fazl, a close friend of the Emperor's, to be put to death on his way back from the Deccan. In 1603 a temporary reconciliation was effected between father and son through the mediation of Sultānā Salīmā Begam. But Salīm again proceeded to Allahābād and began to act in a highly objectionable manner. Meanwhile Khān-i-A'zam, Rājā Mān Singh and some other nobles of the court, plotted to secure the succession for Salīm's son, Khusrav. But their scheme failed owing to the opposition of other nobles. The other sons of Akbar had already died. Salīm, the only surviving son of Akbar, became reconciled to his father after the removal of all the rival claimants. Akbar treated him like a petulant child, rebuked him severely, and confined him for some time before pardoning him in November, 1604. But Akbar's end was drawing near. He was attacked by severe diarrhoea or dysentery in the autumn of 1605 and died on the 17th October.

6. Akbar's Religion

The sublimity of Akbar's conceptions, and the catholicity of his temperament and ideals, were moulded by various influences. Firstly, the influence of his heredity "endowed him with those qualities of head and heart that prepared him to receive the impress of his environments, and reflect it in the best possible way". In spite of their being conquerors, Timur and his descendants were lovers of art and literature and rose above religious orthodoxy, largely owing to their contact with Sufism. Akbar's mother, the daughter of a Persian scholar, sowed in his mind the seeds of toleration. Secondly, Akbar's early contact with Sūfism, during his stay in the court of Kābul, where many Sūfī saints had fled away from Persia under the pressure of Safavī persecution, and

subsequently the influence of his tutor, 'Abdul Latif, impressed upon his mind the worth of liberal and sublime ideas and made him eager to "attain the ineffable bliss of direct contact with the Divine Reality". Lastly, his Rājput wives and his contact with Hinduism, and the reformation movements of his time, made an impression on his imaginative mind. Thus, "intelligent to an uncommon degree, with a mind alert and inquisitive, he was best fitted by birth, upbringing and association to feel most keenly those hankerings and that spiritual unrest which distinguished the century in which he lived. He was not only the child of his century, he was its best replica". It might be that Akbar's political aim of establishing an all-India Mughul Empire had some influence on his religious policy, as political factors largely influenced the religious settlement of his English contemporary, Queen Elizabeth. But there is no doubt that he had a yearning after truth and often "tempests of feeling had broken over Akbar's soul". We are told even by the hostile critic Badāūnī that "he would sit many a morning alone in prayer and melancholy, on a large flat stone of an old building near the (Fathpur) palace in a lonely spot with his head bent over his chest, and gathering the bliss of early hours". The conflicts of the different religious sects shocked his soul, and he devoted himself "to the evolution of a new religion, which would, he hoped, prove to be a synthesis of all the warring creeds and capable of uniting the discordant elements of his vast empire in one harmonious whole".

Akbar observed the external forms of the Sunnī faith until 1575, when his association with Shaikh Mubārak and his two sons, Faizī and Abul Fazl, produced a change in his views. He then caused a building to be constructed at Fathpur Sīkrī, called the *Ibādat-Khāna* or the House of Worship, with a view to discussing philosophical and theological questions. He first summoned there the learned divines of Islam, but their discussions soon took the shape of "vulgar rancour, morbid orthodoxy and personal attacks" and they could not reply to some of the queries of Akbar to his satisfaction. In fact, their petty wranglings, of which Badāūnī gives a graphic picture, failed to satisfy his inquisitive soul, and led him to seek truth elsewhere. He therefore called to the *'Ibādat-Khāna* the wise men of different religions and sects, notably Hindu philosophers like Purushottama, Devī and some others; some Jaina teachers, the most prominent of them being Hari Vijaya Surī, Vijaya Sen Surī and Bhānuchandra Upādhāyya; and Parsī priests and Christian missionaries from Goa. He patiently attended to the arguments of the exponents of each faith, and

"went so far in relation to each religion that different people had reasonable grounds for affirming him to be a Zoroastrian, a Hindu, a Jaina, or a Christian". But he was not converted to any of these faiths, and there is no reason to exaggerate the influence of Christianity over him more than that of any other religion. It seems that being dissatisfied with the bitter controversies of the Muslim divines, he was prompted to study "other religions by means of discourses and debates, which eventually resulted in his eclecticism" and in the promulgation of the *Dīn-i-Ilāhī*. It was a new religion, "compounded", as the Jesuit writer Bartoli says, "out of various elements, taken partly from the Koran of Muhammad, partly from the scriptures of the Brahmans, and to a certain extent, as far as suited his purpose, from the Gospel of Christ". A firm believer in the policy of universal toleration, Akbar made no attempt to force his religion on others with the zeal of a convert or a religious fanatic, but appealed to the inner feelings of men.

Akbar's conception of universal toleration was indeed a noble one, and is a brilliant testimony to his national idealism. Relying on the evidence of Badāūnī, an uncompromising critic of Akbar, and on the writings of the Jesuits, who must have been dissatisfied with the Emperor for their failure to convert him to their faith, Smith wrongly remarks that "the Divine Faith was a monument of Akbar's folly, not of his wisdom. The whole scheme was the outcome of ridiculous vanity, a monstrous growth of unrestrained autocracy". Von Noer, the German historian of Akbar, gives a correct estimate of the Divine Faith when he writes: "Badaoni certainly takes every opportunity of raking up the notion of Akbar's apotheosis for the purpose of renewing attacks upon the great emperor. He, however, was never in intimate relation to the Dīn-i-Ilāhī; he repeats his misconceptions current among the populace, marred and alloyed by popular modes of perception. Akbar might justly have contemplated the acts of his reign with legitimate pride, but many incidents of his life prove him to have been among the most modest of men. It was the people who made a God of the man who was the founder and head of an order at once political, philosophic and religious. One of his creations will assure to him for all time a pre-eminent place among the benefactors of humanity—greatness and universal tolerance in matters of religion."

Akbar has been charged by Badāūnī, and the Jesuit writers, with having renounced Islam in his later years. It is, of course, true that, with a view to commanding the "indivisible allegiance of his subjects", Akbar sought to check the undue influence of the

Ulemas, who, like the Popes in medieval Europe, exerted "a parallel claim to the obedience of the people"; and proceeded, step by step, to establish his position as the supreme head of the Church (*Imām-i-'Ādil*). Thus in June, 1579, he removed the chief preacher at Fathpur Sīkrī and read the *Khutba* in his own name, and in September, 1579, he issued the so-called Infallibility Decree, which made him the supreme arbiter in matters of religion. This must have caused profound resentment among the *Ulemas* and their supporters, but Akbar remained fearless. "He did not mean to assume the spiritual leadership of the nation without having spiritual attainments. . . . From start to finish, from ascending the pulpit at Fathpur Sīkrī to the propagation of *Dīn-i-Ilāhī*, Akbar was intensely sincere." It is unfair to denounce a man of such rational and liberal sentiments as having contempt for other religions or being an enemy of any of these. He never denied the authority of the Quran, not even in the so-called Infallibility Decree. His ideal was a grand synthesis of all that he considered to be the best in different religions—an ideal essentially national, for which he is justly entitled to the gratitude of posterity.

7. Personality of Akbar

An intrepid soldier, a benevolent and wise ruler, a man of enlightened ideas, and a sound judge of character, Akbar occupies a unique position in the history of India. We know from Abul Fazl, and even from the hostile critic Badāūnī, that he had a commanding personality and looked every inch a king. Jahāngīr remarks in his *Memoirs* that his father "in his actions and movements was not like the people of the world, and the glory of God manifested itself in him". Like other princes of the house of Tīmūr, Akbar was endowed with remarkable courage and uncommon physical strength. He was fearless in the chase as well as in the fields of battle, and, "like Alexander of Macedon, was always ready to risk his life, regardless of political consequences". He often plunged his horse into the full-flooded rivers during the rainy season and safely crossed over to the other side. Though a mighty conqueror, he did not usually indulge in cruelty for its own sake. Affectionate towards his relatives, he was not revengeful without cause, and his behaviour towards his brother, Hakīm, shows that he could pardon a repentant rebel. On some rare occasions his temper got the upper hand and then the culprits were summarily dealt with, as is shown by his behaviour towards his maternal uncle, Mu'azzam, and his foster-brother, Ādam Khān. But he usually maintained perfect

self-control. His manners were exceedingly charming and his address pleasant, for which he has been highly praised by all who came in contact with him. He was able to win the love and reverence of his subjects, who considered the Ruler of Delhi to be the Lord of the Universe. Extremely moderate in his diet, he was fond of fruit and had little liking for meat, which he ceased to take altogether in his later years.

Though Akbar probably did not learn how to read and write,[1] he was not uncultured. Possessed of a fine literary taste, a profound intellectual curiosity and a marvellous memory, he took interest in the different branches of learning, such as philosophy, theology, history, and politics. He maintained a library full of books on various subjects, and was fond of the society of scholars, poets and philosophers, who read books to him aloud, and thus enabled him to be conversant with Sūfī, Christian, Zoroastrian, Hindu and Jaina literature. Smith writes that "anybody who heard him arguing with acuteness and lucidity on a subject of debate would have credited him with wide literary knowledge and profound erudition and never would have suspected him of illiteracy". He possessed also a fair taste for art, architecture and mechanical works, and is credited with many inventions and improvements in the manufacture of matchlocks. Gifted with indomitable energy and indefatigable industry, he erected a vast administrative machinery on a comprehensive plan, which will be described in a subsequent chapter. He looked, as we know from the *Āīn-i-Akbarī*, "upon the smallest details as mirrors capable of reflecting a comprehensive outline".

Though ambitious of territorial conquests, through which the limits of the Mughul Empire were extended almost to the furthest limits of Northern India, Akbar was not a selfish and unbridled autocrat. He did not ignore the feelings of the conquered and trample on their rights and privileges with an eye only to self-interest. His ideal of kingship was high. "Upon the conduct of the monarch," said he, "depends the efficiency of any course of action. His gratitude to his Lord, therefore, should be shown in his just government and due recognition of merit; that of his people in obedience and praises." Endowed with the farsightedness of a genius, he built the political structure of the Mughul Empire, and its administrative system, on the co-operation and goodwill of all his subjects. He truly realised the unsoundness of ill-treating the Hindus, who formed the overwhelming majority of

[1] Some writers are now trying to prove Akbar's literacy. *Vide Liberty*, 30th December, 1931, and *Indian Historical Quarterly*, December 1940.

the population, or of relegating them permanently to a position of inequality and humiliation. This shows the transcendental ability of Akbar as a statesman. He not only meted out fair treatment to the Hindus and appointed them to high posts, as Sher Shāh and his successors had done, but also tried to remove all invidious distinctions between the Muslims and non-Muslims. Thus he abolished the pilgrim tax in the eighth year and the *jizya* in the ninth year of his reign, and inaugurated a policy of universal toleration. In fact, he chalked out a rational path for anyone who would aspire to the position of a national ruler of India.

Akbar tried to introduce humane social reforms. He was a patron of art and literature. All this will be described in subsequent chapters. From all points of view his reign forms one of the most brilliant periods in the history of India. Akbar, remarks Smith, "was a born king of men, with a rightful claim to be one of the mightiest sovereigns known to history. That claim rests securely on the basis of his extraordinary natural gifts, his original ideas, and his magnificent achievements".

CHAPTER III

JAHĀNGĪR AND SHĀH JAHĀN

1. Jahāngīr

A WEEK after Akbar's death, Salīm succeeded to the throne at Āgra at the age of thirty-six and assumed the title of Nūr-ud-dīn Muhammad Jahāngīr Pādshāh Ghāzī. Though fond of pleasure he was not absolutely devoid of military ambition, and dreamt of conquering Transoxiana, the seat of government of the early Tīmūrīds. Soon after his accession, he tried, in the words of Asad, "to win the hearts of all the people" by various measures. He granted a general amnesty to his opponents, released prisoners, set up the famous chain of justice between the Shāhburjī in the fort of Āgra and a stone pillar fixed on the banks of the Jumnā, and promulgated twelve edicts, which were ordered to be observed as rules of conduct in his kingdom:—

1. Prohibition of cesses (*zakāt*).
2. Regulations about highway robbery and theft.
3. Free inheritance of property of deceased persons.
4. Prohibition of the sale of wine and of all kinds of intoxicating liquor.
5. Prohibition of seizure of houses and of cutting off the nose and ears of criminals.
6. Prohibition of forcible seizure of property (*Ghasbi*).
7. Building of hospitals and appointment of physicians to attend the sick.
8. Prohibition of the slaughter of animals on certain days.
9. Respect paid to Sunday.
10. General confirmation of *mansabs* and *jāgīrs*.
11. Confirmation of *aimā*[1] lands.
12. Amnesty to all prisoners in forts and in prisons of every kind.

These edicts do not seem to have had very great practical effects.

The few changes that Jahāngīr now effected in the offices of the State were intended to secure him a band of supporters. He

[1] Described in the *Waqiāt-i-Jahāngīrī* as "lands devoted to the purposes of prayer and praise".

rewarded Bīr Singh Bundelā, the murderer of Abul Fazl, with the dignity of a commander of 3,000 horse, while 'Abdur Rahamān, the son of the victim, and Mahā Singh, son of Mān Singh, were elevated only to the rank of a commander of 2,000. Mīrzā Ghiyās Beg, a Persian adventurer and father of Nūr Jahān, who was destined to be famous under the title of I'timād-ud-daulah, was raised to the rank of a commander of 1,500.

The "early pleasant dreams" of Jahāngīr were soon rudely disturbed by the rebellion of his eldest son, Khusrav, whose relations with his father had been far from friendly since the closing years of Akbar's reign. Enjoying the kindness and favour of his grandfather, Khusrav was the most popular prince in the Empire, having many influential supporters like his maternal uncle, Mān Singh, and his father-in-law, Khān-i-A'zam 'Azīz Koka, foster-brother of Akbar. Five months after Jahāngīr's accession, he left Āgra, fled to the Punjab and rose in rebellion. Jahāngīr marched without delay against his son with a large army. He was so greatly perturbed that he even forgot to take his daily dose of opium on the first morning of his march. The Prince's troops were easily defeated by the imperial forces near Jullundur and he was captured with his principal followers, Husain Beg and 'Abdul 'Azīz, while attempting to cross the Chenāb with a view to proceeding to Kābul. He was brought before his father with "his hands bound and a chain on his leg" in open *darbār*, and after being severely reproached was ordered to be imprisoned. His supporters were subjected to cruel punishments.[1] The captive Prince was destined to suffer more till he met his doom in 1622. Khusrav and his nephew, Dārā Shukoh, are two pathetic figures in Mughul history.

The fifth Sikh Guru, Arjan, was sentenced to death,[2] and all his property was confiscated by the Emperor. Apparently the charge against him was that he had helped the rebel prince Khusrav with a sum of money, and some writers believe that the Guru suffered the "penalty for high treason and contumacy". But Jahāngīr's own *Memoirs* make it clear that the Emperor was not guided by purely political considerations. The unfortunate prince whom the Guru helped was, in the words of Terry, "a gentleman of a very lovely presence and fine carriage, exceedingly beloved of the common people . . . the very love and delight

[1] Jahāngīr himself writes: "I gave Khusrav into custody and I ordered these two villains (Husain Beg and 'Abdul 'Azīz) to be enclosed in the skins of a cow and an ass, and to be placed on asses, face to the tail, and so to be paraded round the city." Elliot, Vol. VI, p. 300.

[2] His tomb is situated just outside the Fort of Lahore.

of them all".[1] The Guru's conduct may have been due to his charitable and holy disposition, and need not indicate any hostile intention towards the Emperor personally. The Guru himself justified his action on the grounds of his *dharma* and gratitude for the past favours of Akbar "and not because he was in opposition" to the Emperor Jahāngīr. The execution of the Sikh divine was an impolitic step on the part of Jahāngīr, as it estranged the Sikhs, till then a peace-loving community, and turned them into foes of the Empire.

In May, 1611, Jahāngīr married Nūr Jahān, originally known as Mihr-un-nisa, who considerably influenced his career and reign. Modern researches have discarded the many romantic legends about Mihr-un-nisa's birth and early life and have proved the reliability of the brief account of Mu'tamīd Khān, the author of *Iqbāl-Nāmā-i-Jahāngīrī*. According to it, Mihr-un-nisa was the daughter of a Persian immigrant, Mīrzā Ghiyās Beg, who came to India with his children and wife in the reign of Akbar. She was born on the way to India at Qandahār. Her father rose to high positions during the reigns of Akbar and his son. She was married, at the age of seventeen, to 'Alī Qulī Beg Istajhī, another Persian adventurer, who in the beginning of Jahāngīr's reign received the *jāgīr* of Burdwān in Bengal and the title of Sher-afghān. When Jahāngīr heard that Sher-afghān had grown "insubordinate and disposed to rebellions", he sent in A.D. 1607 his foster-brother, Qutb-ud-dīn, the new governor of Bengal, who was to the Emperor "in the place of a dear son, a kind brother, and a congenial friend", to chastise him. An affray took place between Sher-afghān and Qutb-ud-dīn at Burdwān, in course of which the latter was killed. Sher-afghān was, in his turn, hacked to pieces by the followers of Qutb-ud-dīn, and Mihr-un-nisa was taken to the court with her young daughter. After four years, Mihr-un-nisa's charming "appearance caught the king's far-seeing eye and so captivated him" that he married her, and made her his chief queen. The Emperor, who styled himself Nūr-ud-dīn, conferred on his new consort the title of Nūr Mahal (Light of the Palace), which was soon changed to Nūr Jahān (Light of the World). It is sometimes said that Jahāngīr had been in love with Mihr-un-nisa "when she was still a maiden, during the life-time of Akbar", and that his infatuation for her cost Sher-afghān his life. The truth of this opinion has recently been questioned on the ground that the contemporary Indian historians, and some

[1] Terry, *Voyage to East India*, p. 411. Terry, Sir Thomas Roe's chaplain, met Khusrav several times.

European travellers, are silent about it and it was invented by later writers. But the cause of Mihr-un-nisa being brought to the court, and not to her father, who held an important post in the Empire, has not been explained. That Jahāngīr was not above the habit of having secret love affairs with the ladies of the court is proved by the case of Ānarkalī, for whom he raised in 1615 a beautiful marble tomb[1] at Lahore, bearing the passionate inscription: "Ah! Could I behold the face of my beloved once more, I would thank God until the day of resurrection."

Nūr Jahān was indeed possessed of exquisite beauty, a fine taste for Persian literature, poetry and arts, "a piercing intellect, a versatile temper, and sound common sense". But the most dominating trait of her character was her inordinate ambition, which led her to establish an unlimited ascendancy over her husband. Her father, I'timād-ud-daulāh, and brother, Āsaf Khān, became prominent nobles of the court, and she further strengthened her position by marrying her daughter by her first husband to Jahāngīr's youngest son, Prince Shahryār.

The early part of Jahāngīr's reign witnessed some important military successes. Attention was first directed towards Bengal, the annexation of which had not yet put an end to the Afghān opposition there. The frequent change of governors in Bengal encouraged the local Afghāns to rebel under 'Usmān Khān during the governorship of Islām Khān, who was, however, a capable man and took prompt measures to suppress the rebellion. The Afghāns were defeated by the imperialists on the 12th March, 1612, and their leader, 'Usmān Khān, died from the effect of a severe wound in the head. The political power of the Afghāns, so long opposed to the Mughuls, came to an end, and Jahāngīr's conciliatory policy made them henceforth friendly to the Empire.

The most distinguished triumph of Mughul imperialism during the reign of Jahāngīr was its victory over the Rājputs of Mewār, who had so long defied its might. Amar Singh of Mewār was devoid of the unflinching resolution of Pratāp, and the policy of Prince Khurram, the third son of Jahāngīr, compelled him to negotiate for peace. The Rānā and his son Karan submitted to the Mughuls and recognised the suzerainty of the Empire. The Rānā himself was exempted from personal attendance at the imperial court, and no princess of his family was ever taken to the imperial harem. As Jahāngīr himself observed: "The real point was that as Rānā Amar Singh and his fathers, proud in the strength of their hilly

[1] It became the Church of St. James from 1857 to 1887 and is now the Record Office of the Punjab Government.

country and their abodes, had never seen or obeyed any of the Kings of Hindustān, this should be brought about in my reign." Jahāngīr subsequently placed two life-size marble statues of the Rānā and his son in the garden of his palace at Āgra. By granting generous terms to Mewār and adopting a conciliatory policy towards it, Jahāngīr secured its loyalty for the Mughul Empire till Aurangzeb's policy alienated Rānā Rāj Singh.

In the Deccan, Jahāngīr pursued the forward policy of his father and a desultory war dragged on throughout his reign against the kingdom of Ahmadnagar. Complete success of the Mughul arms over the forces of Ahmadnagar was not possible, owing partly to the strength of the Deccan kingdom and partly to the weak conduct of the war by the imperial troops. The kingdom of Ahmadnagar was then ably served by its Abyssinian minister, Malik 'Ambar, a born leader of men and one of the greatest statesmen that Medieval India produced. His reorganisation of the revenue system of the kingdom on sound lines contributed to its financial stability, and his training of the soldiers, mostly Marāthas, in the guerrilla method of warfare enabled them to cope successfully with the imperialists. Mu'tamīd Khān, the Mughul court-chronicler, who could not have been biased towards Malik 'Ambar, thus describes him: "This 'Ambar was a slave, but an able man. In warfare, in command, in sound judgment, and in administration, he had no rival or equal. He well understood the predatory warfare, which in the language of the Dakhin is called *bargī-giri*. He kept down the turbulent spirits of that country, and maintained his exalted position to the end of his life and closed his career in honour. History records no other instance of an Abyssinian slave arriving at such eminence." The activities of the imperial troops were, on the other hand, greatly hampered by continual dissensions among the commanders. The nominal command of the campaigns was given first to Prince Parwez and subsequently to Prince Khurram. But 'Abdur Rahīm Khān-i-Khānān, and some other chief nobles, really controlled all affairs. They occupied their time more in mutual quarrels than in fighting against the Deccanis. Only a partial success was gained by the Mughuls in A.D. 1616, when Prince Khurram captured Ahmadnagar and some other strongholds. For this victory Khurram was rewarded by his father with the title of Shāh Jahān (King of the World). He received various gifts, and was elevated to the rank of 30,000 *zāt* and 20,000 *sawār*. But the victory of the Mughuls over Ahmadnagar was more apparent than real. The Deccan was far from being completely conquered by them. It has been justly remarked that "nothing could conceal the stern

reality that the expenditure of millions of rupees and thousands of lives had not advanced the Mughul frontier a single line beyond the frontier of 1605".

A notable military success of Jahāngīr's reign was the capture of the strong fortress of Kāngra in the hills of the north-eastern Punjab on the 16th November, 1620. But this event, in which Jahāngīr found cause for exultation, was quickly followed by disasters and rebellions which had no end till he closed his eyes for ever.

The first serious disaster for the Empire was the loss of Qandahār, which had long been a source of friction between the Mughuls and the Persians. Deceiving the Mughul officers by gifts and friendly professions, Shāh 'Abbās (1587–1629), one of the greatest rulers of Asia in his time, took advantage of internal disorders in the Empire to besiege Qandahār in 1621, and finally took it in June, 1622. The huge preparations of Jahāngīr for the recapture of Qandahār were in vain, as his son Shāh Jahān, whom he ordered to lead the expedition, apprehending that his absence from the capital would be utilised by Nūr Jahān to prejudice his claims to the throne, and to strengthen those of her son-in-law, Shahryār, did not move. Alienated by the intrigues of Nūr Jahān, Shāh Jahān soon rose in rebellion against his father, as the Emperor had not the courage or power to restrain the Empress. Placed on the horns of a dilemma—facing the Persian pressure on the north-west and the defection of Shāh Jahān within the heart of the Empire—Jahāngīr was in sore straits. His attention and efforts had soon to be diverted towards the suppression of the danger at home.

Shāh Jahān, joined by the aged officer 'Abdur Rahīm Khān-i-Khānān, at first intended to march on Āgra, but an imperial army under the nominal command of Prince Parwez and with Mahābat Khān as its real leader, completely defeated him at Balochpur, south of Delhi, in 1623. He was chased from province to province and met with repeated reverses. He first proceeded to the Deccan, whence he was driven to Bengal. But unable to maintain his hold there, he returned to the Deccan and for a few years wandered about seeking the alliance of Malik 'Ambar and others. He was finally reconciled to his father in 1625. His sons, Dārā Shukoh and Aurangzeb, were sent to the imperial court, probably to serve as hostages for his good behaviour; and he retired to Nāsik with his wife, Mumtāz Mahal, a niece of Nūr Jahān, and his youngest son, Murād. Thus ended the futile rebellion of Shāh Jahān, with no gain for him but with ample damage to the Empire.

An Afghān by birth, Mahābat Khān held only a *mansab* of 500 in the beginning of Jahāngīr's reign. Being rapidly promoted to higher ranks, he rendered conspicuous services to the Emperor, especially in suppressing the rebellion of Shāh Jahān. But his success excited the jealousy of Nūr Jahān and her brother, Āsaf Khān, and the queen's hostility drove him to rebellion. By a bold *coup de main* he made Jahāngīr a prisoner on the bank of the river Jhelum, while the Emperor was on his way to Kābul. Nūr Jahān managed to escape, but all her attempts to rescue her husband by force having failed, she joined him in confinement. She and her husband were finally able, by outwitting Mahābat Khān, to effect their escape to Rohtās, where the partisans of Jahāngīr had collected a large force. Mahābat Khān ultimately ran away to Shāh Jahān and made peace with him. But Nūr Jahān's triumph was short-lived, for the Emperor died on the 28th October, 1627. His body was buried in a beautiful tomb at Shāhdara, on the banks of the Rāvī.

Jahāngīr is a complex personality in Indian history. Terry writes of him: "Now for the disposition of that King it ever seemed unto me to be composed of extremes: for sometimes he was cruel and at other times he would seem to be exceedingly fair and gentle." Beveridge remarks: "Jahāngīr was indeed a strange mixture. The man who could stand by and see men flayed alive . . . could yet be a lover of justice and could spend his Thursday evenings in holding high converse. . . . He could procure the murder of Abul Fazl and avow the fact without remorse, and also pity the royal elephants because they shivered in winter when they sprinkled themselves with cold water. . . . One good trait in Jahāngīr was his hearty enjoyment of nature and his love of flowers." In the opinion of the Emperor's latest biographer, he was "a sensible, kind-hearted man, with strong family affections and unstinted generosity to all, with a burning hatred of oppression and a passion for justice. On a few occasions in his career as prince and emperor, he was betrayed, not without provocation, by fits of wrath into individual acts of cruelty. But, as a rule, he was remarkable for humanity, affability and an open mind". Francis Gladwin has also observed that "from the beginning to the end of his reign, Jahāngīr's disposition towards his subjects appears to have been invariably humane and considerate". He removed some vexatious transit duties and taxes and made an attempt to prohibit traffic in eunuchs. He had a strong sense of justice. "The first order that I gave," he writes, "was for fastening up the Chain of Justice." This chain,

bearing sixty bells, could be shaken by the humblest of his subjects to bring their grievances to his notice. He imposed penalties without any consideration for the rank of the accused. Thus on passing the capital sentence on an influential murderer, he observed: "God forbid that in such affairs I should consider princes, and far less that I should consider Amīrs." His reign saw the beginning of a new intercourse between Europe and India.

Possessed of a fine aesthetic taste, and himself a painter, Jahāngīr was a patron of art and literature and a lover of nature. His *Tūzuk* (Memoirs) is a brilliant proof of his literary attainments. But he was given to excessive intemperance, which gradually spoiled the finer aspects of his character and was responsible for the inconsistency of his temper. Jahāngīr's attitude towards religion was not so rational as that of his father, but he was not an eclectic or a Christian at heart. With a sincere belief in God, he did not remain satisfied with mere dogmas of any particular creed but was a deist. He loved to converse with Hindu or Muslim saints, and Christian preachers, and valued religious pictures, notably of Christians, but he did not accept the practices or rites of the Hindus, the Zoroastrians or the Christians.

2. Shāh Jahān

A. The Struggle for the Throne

The death of Jahāngīr was followed by a short period of struggle for succession to the throne. Shāh Jahān was still in the Deccan when his father died in October, 1627, and though two of his brothers, Khusrav and Parwez, had already expired, there was another, Prince Shahryār, with a position of advantage in the north. At the instance of his mother-in-law, Nūr Jahān, Shahryār lost no time in proclaiming himself Emperor in Lahore. But Shāh Jahān's cause was ably served by Āsaf Khān, father of Mumtāz Mahal. With much alertness, Āsaf Khān sent a message to Shāh Jahān asking him to come to the north. At the same time, with a view to satisfying the people of the capital, he installed Prince Dāwar Bakhsh, son of the late Prince Khusrav, on the throne as a stop-gap Emperor, pending the arrival of Shāh Jahān. Having won over to his side the *Mīr Bakhshi*, Irādat Khān, Āsaf Khān marched to Lahore, defeated the troops of Shahryār, made him a prisoner and blinded him. Shāh Jahān hurried to Āgra from the Deccan and was proclaimed Emperor in the metropolis in February, 1628, under the lofty title of 'Abul Muzaffar Shihāb-ud-dīn

Muhammad Sāhib-i-qirān II, Shāh Jahān Pādshāh Ghāzī. Soon after this, Prince Dāwar Bakhsh, whom the contemporary chronicler has aptly described as a "sacrificial lamb", was removed from the throne and consigned to prison, but he was subsequently released and went to reside in Persia as a pensioner of its Shāh. Shāh Jahān managed to remove all his possible rivals "out of the world" He lived to see two of his sons executed, a third driven out of the country. He himself spent his last days as a captive.

B. Rebellions

For the time being, however, everything went in the Emperor's favour. He began his reign with profound optimism and success. In recognition of their services, Āsaf Khān and Mahābat Khān were promoted to high offices. The former was made the Wazīr of the Empire and the latter governor of Ajmer. The Emperor easily suppressed two rebellions—one of Jujhār Singh, a Bundelā chief, son of Bīr Singh Bundelā, and the other of a powerful Afghān noble named Khān Jahān Lodī, an ex-viceroy of the Deccan—which, broke out in the first and the second year of his reign respectively. The Bundelā chief was quickly overpowered and retreated into the mountains, whence, however, he continued to create trouble for the Emperor till 1634. Ultimately he was defeated by the imperialists, who forced him to leave his country, and he was killed on the way in a chance skirmish with the Gonds. More formidable than the Bundelā rising was the rebellion of Khān Jahān Lodī, who had allied himself with Nizām-ul-mulk, the last of the Nizām Shāhī rulers of Ahmadnagar, and had some Marātha and Rājput supporters. The success of his efforts, which meant the "carrying out of the traditional hostility of the Afghān chiefs to the Mughul dynasty", would have deprived the Empire of its southern provinces. But Shāh Jahān, having fully realised the gravity of the situation, sent a body of efficient troops to suppress the rebellion. Chased from place to place, deserted by his allies and having lost his friends and relations in battle, the Afghān chief fought desperately against the imperialists for three years but was ultimately defeated at Tāl Sehonda, north of Kālinjar, and cut to pieces with his sons, 'Azīz and Āimal, in the fourth year.

C. Treatment of the Portuguese and Capture of Hugli

The Portuguese had established themselves above Sātgāon in Bengal in or about A.D. 1579 on the strength of an imperial *firman*,

and had gradually strengthened their position by the erection of large buildings round about Hugli, which became consequently more important than Sātgāon from the commercial point of view. But far from remaining satisfied with peaceful commercial pursuits, they gave offence to Shāh Jāhan by some objectionable practices. They not only exacted heavy duties from the Indian traders, especially on tobacco (which had become by that time an important article of trade), at the cost of the revenues of the State, but also became arrogant enough to begin the abominable and cruel practice of slave trading, for which they kidnapped many orphan Hindu or Muslim children, whom they converted to Christianity. Their audacity rose so high that they captured two slave girls of Mumtāz Mahal's. This must have been sufficient to incense the Mughul Emperor. The conversion of Indians to Christianity by some of the Jesuit missionaries added to his resentment against the Portuguese. After his accession to the throne, Shāh Jahān appointed Qāsīm 'Ālī Khān governor of Bengal and charged him with the duty of punishing the Portuguese. Hugli was accordingly besieged by a large army, under the command of Qāsīm 'Ālī Khān's son, on the 24th June, 1632, and was captured after three months. Many of the Portuguese, as we know from the court-chronicler, 'Abdul Hamīd Lāhorī, were killed and a large number of them were taken as prisoners to Āgra, where they suffered terribly.

D. Famine in the Deccan and Gujarāt, 1630–1632

In the fourth and fifth years of the reign of Shāh Jahān an appalling famine of the most severe type desolated the Deccan and Gujarāt. The horrors of this terrible calamity have been thus described by 'Abdul Hamīd Lāhorī: "The inhabitants of these two countries were reduced to the direst extremity. Life was offered for a loaf, but none would buy; rank was to be sold for a cake, but none cared for it; the ever-bounteous hand was stretched out to beg for food; and the feet which had always trodden the way of contentment walked about only in search of sustenance. For a long time dog's flesh was sold for goat's flesh, and the pounded bones of the dead were mixed with flour and sold. When this was discovered, the sellers were brought to justice. Destitution at length reached such a pitch that men began to devour each other, and the flesh of a son was preferred to his love. The numbers of the dying caused obstructions in the roads, and every man whose dire sufferings did not terminate in death and who retained the power to move wandered off to the towns and villages of other

countries." An English merchant-traveller, Peter Mundy, who went on business from Surāt to Āgra and Patnā and came back while the famine was raging, has also left a detailed account of its horrors.

E. The North-West Frontier Policy

Shāh Jahān was determined to recover the important province of Qandahār, without which the Mughul position on the north-west frontier remained comparatively weak. By skilful negotiations he seduced 'Alī Mardān Khān, the Persian governor of Qandahār, from his loyalty to the Shāh and persuaded him to surrender the fortress to the Mughuls. 'Alī Mardān entered the Mughul imperial service and was rewarded with money and honour. The action of 'Alī Mardān Khān deprived Persia of Qandahār, but the Mughuls could not retain it long. The Persians under their energetic ruler, Shāh 'Abbās II, made preparations in August, 1648, with a view to attacking Qandahār during winter, when the snowfall would make it difficult for the Mughuls to bring reinforcements from India. The courtiers of Shāh Jahān unwisely advised him to postpone the work of opposing the Persians till the season was over. "The natural consequence of neglecting an enemy followed. The Persian King triumphed over the depth of winter, his lack of provisions, and other difficulties, on which the courtiers of Shāh Jahān had built their hopes," and besieged Qandahār on the 16th December, 1648. The Mughul garrison ultimately capitulated on the 11th February, A.D. 1649, owing largely to the weakness of Daulat Khān, the incapable Mughul governor of Qandahār. Early in May, Prince Aurangzeb, with the chief minister, Sa'dullah Khān, was deputed to make an attempt to recover Qandahār, and he attacked it on the 16th of that month. But this attempt failed before the superior military preparations and skill of the Persians. Shāh Jahān, however, would not abandon his design of recapturing Qandahār. After three years' preparations the Emperor sent there a powerful expeditionary army with a siege-train, again under Aurangzeb and Sa'dullah Khān, while he himself remained encamped at Kābul to make arrangements for supplies of provisions and munitions of war. The imperial commanders invested Qandahār on the 2nd May, 1652. They had received strict instructions from their master not to deliver an assault on the fortress without making a breach, but they failed to effect it with their inefficient gunnery in the face of the superior artillery of the Persians. Thus the Mughul troops had no success this time also, and Shāh Jahān had to order the abandonment of the siege. A third attempt made

by the Emperor's eldest and favourite son, Dārā Shukoh (now exalted with the title of "*Shāh Buland Iqbāl*" or "King of Lofty Fortune"), in the following year, proved as unlucky as that of his brother. Qandahār was lost to the Mughuls for good, though the campaigns undertaken to recover it during the reign of Shāh Jahān cost no less than twelve crores of rupees, that is, more than half of the annual income of the State, besides valuable lives. Further, the repeated failures of the Mughul troops before Qandahār considerably affected the prestige of the Empire.

F. The Central Asian Policy

The Central Asian adventures of the Mughuls also ended in disasters. Shāh Jahān, like his father and grandfather, dreamt of reconquering the old territories of his ancestors in Central Asia. "Ever since the beginning of his reign," writes 'Abdul Hamīd Lāhorī, "the Emperor's heart had been set upon the conquest of Balkh and Badakhshān, which were hereditary territories of his house, and the keys to the acquisition of Samarqānd, the home and capital of his great ancestor Tīmūr." But the difficulties of mobilising a large army through the lofty ranges of the Hindukush were great, and the utility of the enterprise for the Mughul Empire in India was very doubtful: Shāh Jahān, however, did not consider this. "The prosperity of his reign and the flattery of his courtiers had turned his head and he was dreaming the vainest of vain dreams." In 1646, circumstances being favourable owing to the outbreak of a civil war in the ruling house of the Oxus region, Prince Murād and 'Ālī Mardān occupied Balkh and Badakhshān, which lay hemmed in between the Hindukush and the Oxus. But to consolidate these conquests became impossible. Sick of the uncongenial climate of Balkh and other difficulties, Prince Murād came back to India against the desire of his father, for which he was disgraced. The *wazīr*, Sa'dullah Khān, was soon sent to Balkh to set things right. In the next year the Emperor, determined not to give up his conquests, dispatched Aurangzeb to Balkh with a large army. But the Uzbegs now organised a national resistance against the Mughuls in the face of which Aurangzeb, in spite of his sincere and earnest efforts, could achieve nothing and had to retreat to India after suffering terrible hardships. The Central Asian campaigns cost the Mughul Empire immense loss of men and money. As Sir J. N. Sarkar remarks: "Thus ended Shāh Jahān's fatuous war in Balkh—a war in which the Indian treasury spent four krores of rupees in two years and realised from the

conquered country a revenue of 22½ lakhs only. Not an inch of territory was annexed, no dynasty changed, and no enemy replaced by an ally on the throne of Balkh. The grain stored in the Balkh fort, worth five lakhs, and the provisions in other forts as well, were all abandoned to the Bukhāriāns, besides Rs. 50,000 in cash presented to Nazar Muhammad's grandsons and Rs. 22,500 to envoys. Five hundred soldiers fell in battle and ten times that number (including camp-followers) were slain by cold and snow on the mountains. Such is the terrible price that aggressive imperialism makes India pay for wars across the north-western frontier."

G. Shāh Jahān and the Deccan States

Shāh Jahān resumed the traditional policy of expansion in the south, the whole of which had not been, as we have already noted, thoroughly subdued by Akbar. Akbar could only conquer Khāndesh and annex a portion of Berar. Jahāngīr's attempt to conquer Ahmadnagar was successfully checked by its able minister, Malik 'Ambar. Bijāpur and Golkundā continued to enjoy independence. Much was still left to be accomplished before Mughul imperialism could triumph completely over the Peninsula.

The Nizām Shāhī kingdom of Ahmadnagar, because of its proximity to the Mughul frontier in the south, was the first to feel the weight of Mughul arms. After the death of Malik 'Ambar, the saviour of Ahmadnagar from Mughul attack during the reign of Jahāngīr, in 1626, the kingdom was in a moribund condition. Internal dissensions between the Sultān and his minister, Fateh Khān, the unworthy son of the noble Abyssinian Malik 'Ambar, brought the kingdom within the clutches of the Mughuls in the course of a few years. In 1630 the Mughuls failed to capture Parenda, a strong fortress belonging to Ahmadnagar. But Fateh Khān, dissatisfied with Sultān Nizām-ul-mulk, entered into negotiations with the Mughul Emperor and at the suggestion of the latter secretly made away with his master. To perpetuate his own influence he placed on the throne Nizām-ul-mulk's son, Husain Shāh, a boy only ten years old. He was not at all sincere in his friendship with the Mughuls. When the Mughuls besieged the fortress of Daulatābād in 1631, he at first went against the imperialists but was soon won over by them with a bribe of ten and a half lacs of rupees, and surrendered the fortress. Thus the same ignoble means which had given Asīrgarh to the Mughuls were used by them also to secure Daulatābād. Ahmadnagar was annexed to the Mughul Empire in A.D. 1633, and the

nominal king, Husain Shāh, was consigned to life-long imprisonment in the fort of Gwālior. The dynasty of the Nizām Shāhīs thus came to an end, though an unsuccessful attempt to revive it was made in 1635 by Shāhjī, father of the celebrated Shivājī. As a reward for his help to the Mughuls, Fateh Khān was enrolled in the imperial service at a liberal salary.

The independence of the Shiah States of Golkundā and Bijāpur was highly offensive to the imperialistic and religious zeal of Shāh Jahān. The encroachments of the imperial troops on their territories had already begun in 1629 and 1631 respectively. In the year 1635, when the rulers of those two States secretly helped Shāhjī, who made an attempt to set up a Nizām Shāhī boy as the nominal Sultān of the now defunct kingdom of Admadnagar, the Mughul Emperor called upon them to acknowledge his suzerainty, to send tribute regularly, and to abstain from helping Shāhjī. He marched in person to the Deccan to enforce his demands and on reaching Daulatābād on 21st February, 1636, made vigorous preparations to attack the Deccan States. Overawed by these, 'Abdullah Shāh, Sultān of Golkundā, acknowledged the suzerainty of Shāh Jahān by complying with all the demands of the latter, such as paying an annual tribute to the Emperor, and to striking coins, and having the *Khutba* read, in his name.

But the 'Ādil Shāh of Bijāpur refused to submit to the imperial behest and made a bold stand to defend his rights. Three Mughul armies then attacked his kingdom from three sides—one, under Khān-i-Daurān, from Bīdar in the north-east, another, under Khān Jahān, through Sholāpur in the west, and the third, under Khān-i-Zamān, by way of Indāpur in the north-west. Though by resorting to the time-honoured expedients of cutting off the supplies of the enemy and poisoning the wells, the Bijāpur soldiers bravely defended the capital city, the rest of their kingdom was devastated by the Mughuls. Thus the Sultān was compelled to sue for peace, which was concluded in May, 1636. He acknowledged the suzerainty of the Mughul Emperor, and was required not to molest the kingdom of Golkundā, which was now a dependency of the Emperor. Besides being allowed to hold his ancestral kingdom, the Sultān got portions of the territory of the Ahmadnagar kingdom, the rest of which was absorbed into the Mughul Empire. Both the parties agreed not to suborn their respective officers, and the Sultān was not to assist, or give shelter to, Shāhjī. "Thus after forty years of strife (1595–1636)," writes Sir J. N. Sarkar, "the affairs of the Deccan were at last settled. The position of the Emperor was

asserted beyond challenge, his boundaries clearly defined, and his suzerainty over the southern kingdoms formally established." The Emperor left the Deccan on the 11th July, 1636, and sent his third son, Aurangzeb, then a youth of eighteen, as viceroy of the Mughul Deccan. It was then a fairly extensive territory, comprising four provinces, Khāndesh, Berar, Telingāna, and Daulatābād, and estimated to yield an income of five crores of rupees a year. It contained sixty-four hill forts, some of which were still in the possession of Shāhjī and other hostile chiefs.

The young viceroy engaged himself assiduously in suppressing the enemies of the Empire. He captured the district of Bāglāna, lying between Khāndesh and the Surāt coast, and compelled Shāhjī to submit to him and surrender certain forts. In 1637 he went to Āgra to marry Dilras Bānu Begam, daughter of Shāh Nawāz Khān of the Persian royal family, then employed as a Mughul officer. But Aurangzeb was much embarrassed in his Deccan administration for lack of finance and also by the influence of a hostile party under his brother, Dārā Shukoh. In 1644 he proceeded to Āgra to see his favourite sister, Jahānārā, who had been severely burnt in the month of March and was cured at last in November by an ointment prepared by a slave named Arīf.[1] But three weeks after his arrival at Āgra, Aurangzeb was forced by adverse circumstances to resign his post. The older historians have suggested some vague reasons for this sudden fall of Aurangzeb, which do not offer a true explanation of the situation. 'Abdul Hamīd Lāhorī writes that "misled by the wicked counsels of his foolish companions, he wanted to take to the retired life of an ascetic and had also done some acts which the Emperor disapproved of". In the opinion of Khāfī Khān, Aurangzeb, in order to "anticipate his father's punishment of his bad deeds, himself took off his sword and lived for some days as a hermit" which caused his retirement from the Deccan viceroyalty. The real reason, as found in Aurangzeb's letters, was that owing to Dārā Shukoh's persistent hostility towards him and the partiality of Shāh Jahān for his brother, Aurangzeb found it difficult to carry on the Deccan administration and maintain his self-respect properly and so resigned in disgust.

After his resignation of the viceroyalty of the Deccan, Aurangzeb was appointed governor of Gujarāt in February, 1645, and was subsequently sent on expeditions to Balkh, Badakhshān and

[1] It has been shown by Sir William Foster (*Indian Antiquary*, 1911) and Dr. Smith (*Oxford History*, p. 401), that the story of an English surgeon named Gabriel Boughton curing Jahānārā is not true.

Qandahār, which, as we have already seen, ended in failure. On returning from Qandahār, Aurangzeb could not stay at court in safety, or honourably, owing to the hostility of Dārā Shukoh. He was, therefore, sent to the Deccan as its viceroy for the second time in the beginning of A.D. 1653. From November, 1653, either Daulatābād or Aurangābād was the headquarters of his government.

The task before Aurangzeb was immensely difficult. During the few years following his resignation, the administration of the Deccan had fallen into utter confusion, and its financial condition had become deplorable, through a "succession of short viceroyalties and incompetent viceroys". The administration ran on a constant financial deficit, which had to be made good by draining the imperial exchequer. But this was indeed a shortsighted policy. To improve the finances of the Deccan was, therefore, Aurangzeb's first concern. He not only took steps to promote agriculture in the interests of the peasantry but also adopted certain revenue measures, which considerably improved the economic conditions of his territory and have made his viceroyalty famous in the history of land settlements in the Deccan. He fortunately received valuable assistance from an able Persian revenue officer named Murshid Qulī Khān. Belonging originally to the company of 'Ālī Mardān Khān, Murshid Qulī came to the Deccan with Aurangzeb as *diwān* of Daulatābād and Telingāna and subsequently also of Berar and Khāndesh. For the purpose of revenue-collection, the Deccan *subah* was divided into two parts, the Painghāt or the Lowlands and the Balāghāt or the Highlands, each having its own *diwān* or revenue-minister. The former comprised the whole of Khāndesh and one half of Berar and the latter covered the rest of the territories under viceregal control. Besides reorganising the Deccan finances, Murshid Qulī extended there Todar Mall's system of survey and assessment, with some changes suited to local conditions. Thus in the areas which were thinly populated and where agriculture was in a comparatively backward stage he retained the traditional system of a fixed lump sum payment per plough, while elsewhere he introduced the system of *bātāi* (metayership), under which the share of the State varied according to the nature of the crop and the source of water. In certain parts he introduced another system of assessment known as the *jarib*. According to it, the State-revenue, to be paid in kind, was fixed per *bighā* on a uniform claim to one-fourth of the produce, after a careful measurement of the lands and consideration of the quality and quantity of their produce. Steps were also taken to improve the condition of the

ruined villages and help the agriculturists with advance payments. On the whole, the wise measures of Murshid Qulī contributed to the restoration of prosperity in the Deccan, though the accumulated evils of several years' bad government were too numerous to be removed completely within a short time. Sir J. N. Sarkar observes on the authority of Bhīmsen Burhānpurī, the author of *Nuskha-i-Dilkhushā*, that in 1658 there was not "a single piece of waste land near Aurangābād; wheat and pulse sold at 2½ maunds a rupee, *jawar* and *bajrā* at 3½ maunds, molasses at half a maund, and yellow oil (ghee) at 4 seers".[1]

Having thus reorganised the internal administration, Aurangzeb turned his attention towards destroying the independence of the rich Shiah States of Golkundā and Bijāpur. Excuses for immediate attack were not lacking. So far as the State of Golkundā, already a tributary of the Mughul Empire since 1636, was concerned, it had been frequently in arrears in payment of the stipulated tribute. A more plausible plea was found in the Sultān's treatment of his powerful minister, Mīr Jumla, who had secured the protection of the Mughuls.

Muhammad Sa'īd, better known as Mīr Jumla, was a Persian merchant-adventurer. Like several other adventurers, he made a vast fortune, by trading in diamonds and precious stones, and soon entered the service of 'Abdullah Qutb Shāh, the Sultān of Golkundā. His exceptional talents, military genius, and administrative capacity, were appreciated by his master, who made him the chief minister of the State. Mīr Jumla took advantage of his position to make himself the virtual dictator of the State. He went further and soon carved out a dominion for himself by extensive conquests in the Karṇātak. This dominion, about three hundred miles long and fifty miles broad, yielded him an annual revenue of forty lacs of rupees and enabled him to maintain a powerful army, especially strong in artillery. Thus, though his "rank was that of a noble, he possessed the power, wealth and grandeur of a ruling prince". Naturally alarmed at the growing power and wealth of his minister, the Sultān tried to coerce him into obedience and arrested his son, Muhammad 'Amīn Khān, with his family, for his insolent behaviour towards him. Mīr Jumla then entered into intrigues with the Mughul Emperor and Aurangzeb. The latter realised that the friendship of this discontented and semi-independent officer would be of immense service to him in his meditated attack on Golkundā.

Thus the Sultān of Golkundā was betrayed by Mīr Jumla

[1] Sarkar, *Aurangzeb*. Vol. I, p. 173.

Aurangzeb procured an order from Shāh Jahān bidding the Sultān of Golkundā release Mīr Jumla's family, but without allowing the Sultān a reasonable time to reply to the Emperor's letter, he declared war against him. Acting under Aurangzeb's instructions, his son, Prince Muhammad Sultān, attacked Hyderābād in January, 1656, and the Mughul soldiery plundered the country. Aurangzeb himself reached there on the 6th February and besieged Golkundā the next day. His ambition was nothing short of the complete annexation of the kingdom. But the intervention of Shāh Jahān, under the influence of Dārā Shukoh and Jahānārā, prevented it. In obedience to the orders of his father, Aurangzeb was compelled to raise the siege of Golkundā on the 30th March, 1656, and the kingdom thus got a further lease of life on paying to the Mughul Emperor an indemnity of ten lacs of rupees and ceding to him the district of Rangīr (modern Mānikdrug and Chinoor). Prince Muhammad Sultān, Aurangzeb's son, was married by proxy to the Sultān's daughter, and, by a secret arrangement, Aurangzeb extorted a promise from the Sultān to make his new son-in-law his heir. Mīr Jumla was soon afterwards appointed prime minister of the Empire.

Next came the turn of the kingdom of Bijāpur, which had fallen into disorder after the death of its capable ruler, Muhammad 'Ādil Shāh, on the 4th November, 1656. This presented an opportunity to Aurangzeb for the fulfilment of his design. He obtained Shāh Jahān's permission to invade the kingdom on the ground that the new ruler of Bijāpur, a youth of eighteen years, was not the son of the deceased Sultān but his origin was obscure. This was nothing but a flimsy pretext and it is clear that the war against Bijāpur "was wholly unrighteous. Bijāpur was not a vassal State, but an independent ally of the Mughul Emperor, and the latter had no lawful right to confirm or question the succession at Bijāpur. The true reason for the Mughul interference was the helplessness of its boy-king and the discord among his officers, which presented a fine 'opportunity for annexation', as Aurangzeb expressed it". With the assistance of Mīr Jumla, Aurangzeb invaded the kingdom early in January, 1657, and, after a prolonged siege, reduced the fortress of Bīdar towards the end of March and of Kalyānī on the 1st August. Further conquest of the Deccan was prevented by the sudden intervention of Shāh Jahān under the influence of Dārā Shukoh and other opponents of Aurangzeb. The Emperor granted peace to the Sultān of Bijāpur (1657), as conditions of which the latter had to pay a heavy indemnity, like the Sultān of Golkundā, and surrender Bīdar, Kalyānī and Parenda. The

illness of Shāh Jahān, and the consequent scramble for the throne among his sons, postponed the complete fulfilment of Aurangzeb's designs in the Deccan, which thus gained a respite for about thirty years.

H. War of Succession

Shāh Jahān's last days were made highly tragic by the outbreak of a terrible war of succession among his sons. It broke out as soon as he fell ill in September, 1657, and subjected the old Emperor to extreme humiliation and agony till his exit from this world. Shāh Jahān had four sons, all of mature age at that time—Dārā Shukoh aged 43, Shujā aged 41, Aurangzeb aged 39, and Murād aged 33—and two daughters, Jahānārā, who sided with Dārā Shukoh, and Raushnārā, who joined the party of Aurangzeb. All the brothers had by that time gained considerable experience in civil and military affairs as governors of provinces and commanders of armies, but there were differences among them in personal qualities and capacities. The eldest of them, Dārā Shukoh, was in the confidence of his father, who desired him to be his successor. A man of eclectic views, liberal disposition, and of scholarly instincts,[1] Dārā Shukoh mixed with the followers of other faiths and studied the doctrines of the Vedānta, the Talmud, the New Testament and the works of Sūfī writers. He caused a Persian version of the Atharva Veda and the Upanishads to be made with the assistance of some Brāhmaṇa scholars[1] and aimed at finding a *modus vivendi* among the apparently hostile creeds. For this he naturally incurred the displeasure of the orthodox members among his co-religionists, who went against him. But he was not a heretic. He never "discarded the essential dogmas of Islam; he only displayed the eclecticism of the Sūfīs, a recognised school of Islamic believers. If he showed contempt for the external rites of religion, he only shared the standpoint of many noble thinkers of all Churches, such as John Milton". His latest biographer has aptly remarked: "It is hardly an exaggeration to say that any one who intends to take up the solution of the problem of religious peace in India must begin the work where Dārā had left it, and proceed on the path chalked out by that prince." But the excessive fondness of his father for him, and his constant presence at the court, prevented the growth in him of the qualities of an astute politician or the abilities of a brave general and also bred in him a

[1] For a list of Dārā Shukoh's works *vide J.P.H.S.*, Vol. II, pp. 21–38; *J.A.S.B.*, Part I, 1870, pp. 273–9; Sarkar's *Aurangzeb*, Vol. I, p. 271 footnote; Qanungo, *Dara Shukoh*, Vol. I, Chapter VI.

sense of pride, which made him contemptuous of advice. His anger was, however, "seldom more than momentary". The second brother, Shujā, then governor of Bengal, possessed intelligence and was a brave soldier. But his excessive love of ease and pleasure made him "weak, indolent, and negligent, incapable of sustained effort, vigilant caution, and profound combination". The youngest, Murād, then governor of Gujarāt, was no doubt frank, liberal and brave, but was addicted to hard drinking and could not therefore develop the qualities needed for leadership. Aurangzeb, the third brother, was the ablest of all. He possessed uncommon industry and profound diplomatic and military skill, and an unquestionable capacity for administration. Further, as a zealous Sunnī Mussalmān, he naturally obtained the support of the orthodox Sunnīs. As we shall see, the differences in the character of the rival princes did much to influence the course of the struggle. Dārā Shukoh, a liberal man but an ill-qualified general and statesman, was a poor match for the clever and intelligent Aurangzeb; Shujā and Murād had also to suffer for their incompetence before the superior generalship and tact of Aurangzeb.

Dārā Shukoh alone of the four brothers was present at Āgra when Shāh Jahān fell ill in September, 1657. The illness was indeed serious and it was suspected by the three absentee brothers that their father had really expired and the news had been suppressed by Dārā Shukoh. So precarious is the position of an autocracy that even the illness of the Emperor gave rise to confusion and disorder in the kingdom, which became more intense as soon as the fratricidal contest commenced. Shujā proclaimed himself Emperor at Rājmahal, the then capital of Bengal, and marched towards the metropolis of the Empire. But on arriving near Benares he was defeated by an army sent against him under Dārā Shukoh's son, Sulaimān Shukoh, and was forced to retire to Bengal. Murād also crowned himself at Ahmadābād (5th December, 1657). He joined Aurangzeb at Mālwa and formed an alliance with him. They entered into an agreement to partition the Empire, which was solemnised in the name of God and the Prophet. The terms of the agreement were: (i) "one-third of the booty would belong to Murād Bakhsh and two-thirds to Aurangzeb, (ii) after the conquest of the Empire, the Punjab, Afghānistān, Kāshmīr and Sind would belong to Murād, who would set up the standard of kingship there, issue coins and proclaim his own name as king". The combined troops of Aurangzeb and Murād marched towards the north and reached Dharmāt, fourteen miles south-south-west of Ujjain. The Emperor sent Rājā Jaswant Singh of Jodhpur and Qāsim Khān to check

their advance. The hostile armies met at Dharmāt on the 15th April, 1658, where the imperialists were signally defeated, owing partly "to the evils of divided counsels" and jealousy between the Hindu and Muslim soldiers and partly to the inferior military tactics of Jaswant Singh as compared with those of Aurangzeb, who had "aged in war". The Rāthors fought with desperate valour and suffered heavy losses, while Qāsīm Khān did almost nothing to serve the cause of his master. When Jaswant Singh fled to Jodhpur his proud wife shut the gates of the castle against him for retreating from the field of battle. The battle of Dharmāt immensely added to Aurangzeb's resources and prestige. As Sir J. N. Sarkar remarks: "The hero of the Deccan wars and the victor of Dharmāt faced the world not only without loss but with his military reputation rendered absolutely unrivalled in India."

The victorious princes crossed the Chambal over a neglected ford and reached the plain of Samūgarh, eight miles to the east of Āgra Fort. Dārā Shukoh had also advanced there towards the end of May to meet his opponents with an army of 50,000 soldiers "formidable in appearance only" but "composed of a miscellaneous host of diverse classes and localities, hastily got together and not properly co-ordinated nor taught to act in concert". A battle ensued on the 29th May. It was hotly contested and both parties fought bravely, Murād getting three wounds in the face. True to the tradition of their race, the Rājputs under Dārā Shukoh fought gallantly under their brave young leader, Rām Singh, and perished to a man in making a desperate attack upon the division of Prince Murād. Unluckily for Dārā Shukoh, his elephant being severely wounded by an arrow, he got down from it and mounted a horse. "That action," observes Smith, "settled the fate of the battle." Finding the *howdāh* of their master's elephant empty, the surviving troops thought that he had fallen and dispersed from the field in utter confusion. Filled with despair, Dārā Shukoh fled towards Āgra, leaving his camp and guns to be captured by his enemies, and reached there "in an unspeakably wretched condition". The defeat of Dārā Shukoh was in fact due to some tactical errors on the part of his generals and to the weaker condition of his artillery, and it was not caused wholly, as some accounts would lead us to believe, by the artful advice of Khalīlullāh, who was in charge of the right wing of his army.

The battle of Samūgarh practically decided the issue in the succession war among the sons of Shāh Jahān. The discomfiture of Dārā, with the loss of many of his soldiers, made it easier for Aurangzeb to realise his ambition. It may very well be said that

the capture of the throne of Hindustān by Aurangzeb was almost a logical sequel to his victory at Samūgarh. Soon after this victory he marched to Āgra and seized the fort there on the 8th June following, defying all efforts of Shāh Jahān for an amicable settlement and baffling the attempts of the imperial defenders of the fort to prevent its capture.

Deprived of his throne, Shāh Jahān had to suffer most callous treatment. When Aurangzeb, as a sort of offensive measure against the defenders of the Āgra fort, stopped the supply of water from the Jumnā, the unhappy Emperor had to quench his thirst in the dry summer of June with brackish water from the wells within the fort. He wrote to Aurangzeb in a pathetic tone:—

> "Praised be the Hindus in all cases,
> As they ever offer water to their dead.
> And thou, my son, art a marvellous Mussalmān,
> As thou causest me in life to lament for (lack of) water."

Placed under strict confinement as an ordinary prisoner Shāh Jahān was denied even the common conveniences. Aurangzeb turned a deaf ear to all requests of the Emperor and Jahānārā for reconciliation; and the unhappy Emperor "at last bowed to the inevitable, and, like a child that cries itself to sleep, ceased to complain". He found solace in religion, and, in a spirit of resignation, passed his last days in prayer and meditation in the company of his pious daughter, Jahānārā, till at last death, at the age of seventy-four, on the 22nd January, 1666, relieved him of all his miseries.

From Āgra Aurangzeb started towards Delhi on the 13th June, 1658. But on the way he halted at Rupnagar near Mathurā to crush the opposition of his brother, Murād, who had by that time been able to see through the design of his brother and had grown jealous of him. Instead of meeting Murād in the open field, Aurangzeb inveigled him into a trap. The unfortunate Prince was imprisoned first in the fort of Salīmgarh, whence he was removed to the fortress of Gwālior in January, 1659, and was executed on the 4th December, 1661, on the charge of murdering Diwān 'Alī Naqī. Already after Murād's arrest, Aurangzeb had gone to Delhi, where, on the 21st July, 1658, he crowned himself as Emperor.

Aurangzeb next proceeded to deal with his other rivals. The defeat of Dārā Shukoh at Dharmāt and Samūgarh emboldened Shujā to make a fresh bid for power. But his hopes were shattered when Aurangzeb signally defeated him at Khajwah, near Allahābād, on the 5th January, 1659. He was chased by Mīr Jumla

through West Bengal to Dacca and thence to Arākān in May, 1660. Nothing was again heard of Shujā. He was probably slaughtered with his family by the Arākānese. Aurangzeb's eldest son, Prince Muhammad, having quarrelled with Mīr Jumla, joined Shujā for a time. But he was punished for this with imprisonment for life and met his death about 1676.

When fortune went against Dārā Shukoh, his son, Sulaimān Shukoh, was also deserted by his generals and soldiers, who thought that there was no gain in following the "losing side any longer". After fleeing from place to place, Sulaiṃān Shukoh, with his wife, a few other ladies, his foster-brother, Muhammad Shāh, and only seventeen followers, found refuge with a Hindu Rājā of the Garhwal Hills, who "was all kindness and attention to his princely guest in distress". But pressed by Aurangzeb, his host's son betrayed him into the hands of his enemies on the 27th December, 1660. The captive prince, then in the prime of his youth and singularly handsome, was brought in chains before Aurangzeb and told him that he would prefer immediate death to slow poisoning by means of *poustā* drink or "infusion of opium-poppy heads". Aurangzeb promised "that this drink should not be administered, and that his mind might be perfectly easy". But the promise was not kept, and the dreadful drink was administered every morning to the unlucky prince until in May, 1662, "he was sent to the next world through the exertions of his keepers". Dārā Shukoh's younger son, Sipihr Shukoh, and Murād's son, Izid Bakhsh, not being considered serious rivals, were granted their lives and were subsequently married to the third and the fifth of Aurangzeb's daughters respectively.

The story of Dārā Shukoh's end is no less sad and pathetic than that of his brother, Murād, or of his son, Sulaimān Shukoh. After the capture of Āgra by Aurangzeb and the captivity of Shāh Jahān, Dārā Shukoh fled from Delhi to Lahore, where he busied himself in preparations to encounter the pursuing troops of Aurangzeb. He adopted some measures to guard the ferries over the Sutlej and hoped that as the rains set in, it would take some time for Aurangzeb to reach Lahore. "But in hoping thus," writes Sir J. N. Sarkar, "he had counted without Aurangzeb's energy and strength of will, before which every obstacle—human or physical—gave way." About a month after Dārā's arrival at Lahore, his "dreaded rival" crossed the Sutlej with his army and drove Dārā with his family to Multān. The fugitive prince, still chased from place to place by the chief officers of Aurangzeb, who himself had returned to the east in September, 1657, to remove

the dangers created by Shujā and Sulaimān Shukoh, at last succeeded in reaching Gujarāt. Here he was unexpectedly fortunate in being welcomed (January, 1659) and helped financially by its newly appointed governor, Shāh Nawāz Khān, who cherished resentment against Aurangzeb. Being thus able to recuperate his strength to some extent, Dārā was thinking of returning to the Deccan, where he expected support from the Shiah rulers of Bijāpur and Golkundā. This would have been the right policy for him. But Jaswant Singh, who had been already won over by Aurangzeb, lured him by promises of help to march towards Ajmer. The Rājput chief, whose conduct during this war of succession was questionable, proved false to his promises and Dārā could not get the much-hoped-for Rājput help. He was forced to fight with Aurangzeb, who had arrived near Ajmer. Considering it inadvisable, in view of his scanty resources, to meet the overwhelming strength of his enemy's army in a pitched battle in the open field, Dārā entrenched himself in a strong and admirably selected position at the pass of Deorāi, four miles south of Ajmer, and fought for three days, 12th–14th April, 1659. But he was ultimately defeated and found safety in hurried flight. Hunted from place to place (Rājputāna, Cutch and Sind) by the troops of Aurangzeb under Jai Singh and Bahādur Khān, Dārā found no asylum in India. He hurried towards the north-west frontier in June, 1659, and sought shelter with Jiwān Khān, the Afghān chief of Dadar (a place nine miles east of the Bolān Pass), whom he had saved, a few years back, from the sentence of death passed on him by Shāh Jahān. But on the way to Dadar "the greatest of all misfortunes" befell him. His wife, Nādira Begam, who had been his devoted companion in his days of wanderings and had been suffering for some time from an attack of diarrhoea, now succumbed to prolonged hardships and want of medicine and rest. This threw Dārā into utter bewilderment and intense grief.[1] "Mountain after mountain of trouble," remarks Khāfī Khān, "thus pressed upon the heart of Dārā, grief was added to grief, sorrow to sorrow, so that his mind no longer retained its equilibrium." To add to his misfortune, the faithless Afghān chief betrayed him and made him over, with his two daughters and his second son, Sipihr Shukoh,

[1] It should be noted that the Mughul princes, in spite of their polygamous habits, showed an intense passion of conjugal love. As Dr. Smith points out, "A beautiful album in the India Office Library is a pathetic memorial of Dara Shukoh's love". It bears the following inscription in his handwriting: "This album was presented to his nearest and dearest friend, the Lady Nādirah Begam, by Prince Muhammad Dārā Shukoh, son of the Emperor Shāh Jahān, in the year 1051" (A.D. 1641–1642).

to Bahādur Khān, who brought the captives to Delhi on the 23rd August, 1659. On the 29th of the same month they were paraded throughout the city. "To complete his humiliation," writes Sir J. N. Sarkar, "Dārā was seated in an uncovered *howdāh* on the back of a small female elephant covered with dirt. . . . Exposed to the full blaze of an August sun, he was taken through the scenes of his former glory and splendour. In the bitterness of disgrace, he did not raise his head, nor cast his glance on any side, but sat like a crushed twig." His tragic plight excited pity in the hearts of the citizens. Bernier, an eye-witness of the scene, writes: "The crowd assembled was immense; and everywhere I observed the people weeping, and lamenting the fate of Dārā in the most touching language. . . . From every quarter I heard piercing and distressing shrieks . . . men, women and children wailing as if some mighty calamity had happened to themselves." But not a single hand could be raised to rescue the unfortunate prince, as he was girt round by cavalry and archers. Then a popular riot, directed against the traitor Malik Jiwān Khān, broke out on the 30th August. This riot hastened the end of Dārā, whose life could no longer be prolonged by Aurangzeb. His case was placed before the Doctors of Muslim law, who condemned him on a charge of deviation from the Islamic faith. On the night of the 30th August the executioners snatched Sipihr away from his father's embrace and beheaded Dārā. By Aurangzeb's order his corpse was paraded throughout the city to let the people know that their favourite was no more, and then buried in a vault under the dome of the tomb of Humāyūn. Thus the reign of Shāh Jahān, which had begun with high prospects, came to a close in a series of dark tragedies.

I. A Critical Estimate of Shāh Jahān's Character and Reign

Shāh Jahān was not essentially an unrelenting or excessively pleasure-seeking ruler, as European writers like Roe, Terry, Bernier, and De Laet considered him to be, and, as a modern writer, Dr. Smith, also holds. There are, of course, certain instances of his severity. Stern as a conqueror and unsparing to his political rivals, Shāh Jahān indeed acquired his throne by means that left unpleasant memories; but when we take into consideration the circumstances in which he had been placed through the ceaseless intrigues of Nūr Jahān, "we lose", as Dow writes, "half our rage in the pressure of circumstances that drove him to such a ghastly step". Further, "for these early crimes he

made ample amends by the strict justice and clemency of his government and his solicitude for the well-being of his subjects". Thus he did much to alleviate the sufferings of the people during the severe famine of 1631–1632 and displayed considerable industry in the task of administration. Though not as great a warrior as some of his ancestors, Shāh Jahān was not devoid of military qualities. He was a zealous champion of his faith. He revived the pilgrimage tax and took steps not only to check the conversion of the Muslims to other faiths but also to add to their number. Brought up by Ruqayyā Begam, he could read and speak in Turkī, and trained in his early life by such eminent teachers as Mullā Qāsīm Beg Tabrezī, Hakim Dawāi, Shaikh 'Abdul Khair and Shaikh Sūfī, he could speak both Persian and Hindī. Not pitiless by nature, Shāh Jahān was a loving father and a devoted husband. He had an intense love for Mumtāz Mahal, whom he had married in 1612. The couple enjoyed a happy life for about nineteen years, and Mumtāz was her husband's unfailing friend and prudent adviser in the days of his adversity. She died in child-birth in 1631, and to immortalise her name, Shāh Jahān built on her grave the famous Tāj Mahal, which stands unrivalled as a memorial of conjugal attachment.

The reign of Shāh Jahān is usually considered to have been the golden period of Mughul rule in India, which then reached its climax. There was no serious challenge to the Emperor's authority before the war of succession. No grave external menace threatened India itself. The period saw the development of the export trade between India and Western Asia and the beginning of the export trade with Europe, and the finances of the State were flourishing. It was also marked by pomp and splendour, which were amply attested by brilliant productions in architecture, like the magnificent *Tāj*, the *Pearl Mosque* of Āgra, the *Diwān-i-'Am*, the *Diwān-i-khās*, the *Jāmi' Masjid* and the "celebrated Peacock Throne". All these lead one to believe that peace and prosperity prevailed throughout the Empire. But a careful study of the accounts of the contemporary European travellers, and the records of the English factories in India, show "that there were shadows in the picture which were ignored by the court annalists". Beneath the surface of outward splendour and apparent prosperity, there were some grievous anomalies in the economic system of the country. The factory records of the time bear out the statement of Bernier that the misrule of the provincial governors "often deprived the peasant and artisan of the necessaries of life". Further, the maintenance of an elaborate bureaucracy and a large

MUGHUL INDIA
Kilometres
0 200 400 600 800
T I B E T
PAMIRS
Balkh
U Z B E G S
Dorah P.
Kaoshan
Bamian
Kabul
Khyber P.
Ghazni
Peshawar
Kandahar
Lahore
Multan
Srinagar
Kangra
Amritsar
Panipat
Delhi
Bikaner
Jodhpur
Umarkot
Haldighat
Chitor
Ajmere
Mirtha
Debrai
Jaipur
Khanwah
Agra
Samugarh
Kahauj
Kalpi
Gwalior
Ramthambor
Allahabad
Kalinjar
Benares
Rohtas
Chanderi
Chauza
Patna
Rajmahal
Gaur
Dacca
Chittegong
Ahmadabad
Cambay
Champaner
Dhamnar
Ujjain
Burhanpur
Asirgarh
Surat
Daman
Diu
Aurangabad
Ahmadnagar
Bombay
Raigarh
Satara
Bidar
Bijapur
Haidarabad
Golconda
Talikota
Goa
Bellary
Masulipatam
Chandragiri
Madras
Nellore
Pondicherry
Gingi
Cannano e
Calicut
Palghat
Tanjore
Negapatam
Cochin
Madura
CEYLON
Colombo
Cuttack
Chandernagore
Calcutta
Tukaroi
R. Indus
R. Jhelam
R. Chenab
R. Ravi
R. Sutlej
R. Jumna
R. Ganges
R. Brahmaputra
R. Gomal
R. Kabul
R. Kunar
R. Malakand
R. Khandab
R. Lhob
R. Brass
R. Chambal
R. Sind
R. Betwa
R. Son
R. Gumti
R. Gogra
R. Gandak
R. Damodar
R. Narbadda
R. Tapti
R. Godavari
R. Bhima
R. Krishna
R. Tungabhadra
R. Pennar N.
R. Pennar S.
R. Mahanadi
R. Cauvery
PERSIA
SULAIMAN MTS.
ARAVALLI HILLS
VINDHYA RANGE
SATPURA
KHANDESH
GUJARAT
MARWAR
MEWAR
MALWA
BERAR
AHMADNAGAR
GONDWANA
RAJPUTANA
SIND
BIHAR
BENGAL
ASSAM
HIMALAYA MOUNTAINS
Bolan Pass
Ambur P.
Boundary of Akbar's Empire
Aurangzeb's Empire
Early Maratha Kingdom

army, and the expenses incurred for the splendid architectural monuments, imposed a heavy burden upon the agriculturists and the manufacturers, on whose prosperity depended the very existence of the Empire. Thus began a process of national insolvency, which, being accelerated during the next reign, proved to be one of the potent causes of the subsequent disintegration of the mighty Timūrid Empire in India, which had been reared and developed by the genius of Akbar and his coadjutors. In short, India under Shāh Jahān resembles France under Louis XIV in many respects. The military system of the State was also growing weaker and the revenue administration was growing lax.

CHAPTER IV

AURANGZEB 'ĀLAMGĪR (1658–1707)

1. Two Halves of the Reign

AURANGZEB'S remarkable reign of fifty years can be "naturally divided into two equal parts", each having its own well-defined features distinguishing it from the other. During the first part, that is from 1658 to 1681, the north remained the centre of interest and of all important developments, civil and military, while the south "figured as a far-off and negligible factor". But in the second half of the reign the centre of political gravity shifted from Northern India to the Deccan, where the Emperor went in 1681 with his family, his court and the bulk of his army, and the administration of the north was consequently neglected, plunging the whole of it into disorder and anarchy. The Emperor was able to crush the Muslim Sultānates of Bijāpur and Golkundā, but in his struggle with the nascent nationalism of the Marāthas, the issue remained undecided. The Deccan exodus produced disastrous consequences for the Empire, and the long reign of Aurangzeb, in spite of his wonderful industry and splendid devotion to duty, culminated in tragedy.

2. Accession and Two Coronations

We have already related the story of Aurangzeb's acquisition of the throne. He was twice enthroned—once on the 21st July, 1658, immediately after his occupation of Āgra, and again with great éclat in June, 1659, after his decisive victories at Khajwah and Deorāi. The *Khutba* was read in his name and he assumed the title of *'Ālamgīr* (Conqueror of the World) with the additions of *Pādshāh* (Emperor) and *Ghāzī* (Holy Warrior). Like some other Muslim rulers, Aurangzeb began his reign with attempts to alleviate the distress of the people, caused by general administrative disorders during the war of succession and the famine prices of goods. He remitted many vexatious cesses and taxes, but, as in the case of earlier rulers, his prohibition, except in one or two cases, "had no effect".

3. Territorial Expansion: North-Eastern Push

The territorial expansion of the Mughul Empire, which was a process continuing through two centuries, went on apace in the reign of Aurangzeb. If we exclude the losses of the preceding reign in Qandahār and Central Asia, the conquests of the Emperors had remained intact, and before the rise of the Marātha kingdom in the south, Aurangzeb's "ambitious and enterprising officers" successfully extended their master's dominion. Palāmau was conquered in 1661 by Dāūd Khān, the governor of Bihār. On the eastern frontier of the Empire the officers of Aurangzeb found ample scope for their energies. In 1661 Mīr Jumla, the governor of Bengal, set out with a well equipped army towards this frontier to check the aggressions of the Āhoms. A people of Mongoloid origin, the Āhoms had migrated from their original home in Upper Burma and occupied a part of the Brahmaputra valley as early as the thirteenth century A.D. Gradually extending their territories to the west during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, they established a dominion which by the end of the seventeenth century stretched up to the Bar Nadī river in the north-west and the Kalāng river in the south-west. Here they were gradually Hinduised and adopted the Hindu religion and customs. At the same time, the eastern limit of the Mughul Empire had been extended up to the Bar Nadī river by the conquest of Koch Hājo, embracing the present districts of Kāmarūpa and Goālpārā. This made a conflict between the Mughuls and the Āhoms inevitable. As a matter of fact, the Mughuls had already had to fight hard with the Āhoms, when the latter raided the eastern frontier of the Empire during the reign of Shāh Jahān, and a peace was concluded early in 1639. But taking advantage of the war of succession, the Āhoms occupied Gauhātī in 1658 and seized 140 horses, 40 pieces of cannon, 200 matchlocks and much property. To punish these aggressors, Mīr Jumla started from Dacca early in November, 1661, with a powerful army of 12,000 cavalry and 30,000 infantry, provided with artillery, provisions for siege and a number of armed boats, which were indispensably necessary for carrying on war in those parts. His early operations were successful. He conquered both Cooch Bihār and Assam, and sharing with the common soldiers all the hardships which the "opposition of Nature and man" could impose during his "triumphant march", he reached Garhgāon, the capital of the Āhom kingdom, on the 17th March, 1662. The Āhoms now offered little resistance and left their capital and property to the mercy of the imperialists, who got enormous spoils.

But Nature soon fought for the Āhoms. With the commencement of the rainy season, Mīr Jumla's army suffered terribly from the unhealthy climate and lack of provisions and medicine. Emboldened by this, the Āhoms, who "had been scared away and not crushed", soon resumed the offensive and began to harass the Mughuls, whose sufferings increased owing to the outbreak of pestilence and famine in their camp. But, undaunted by the odds, the Mughul governor continued to fight and resumed the offensive after the rains. Considering that further resistance would be of no avail, the Āhoms concluded a treaty of peace with the imperialists. Thus, "judged as a military exploit", remarks Sir J. N. Sarkar, "Mīr Jumla's invasion of Assam was a success". The Āhom king, Jayadhvaj, promised to pay an annual tribute, and a heavy war-indemnity, a part of which was to be delivered immediately and the rest was to be cleared off during the next twelve months in three equal instalments. The Mughuls were also to occupy more than half the province of Darrang, rich in elephants. But this success was purchased at a great cost. It caused immense hardships to the Mughuls and the loss of many lives, including that of Mīr Jumla himself, one of Aurangzeb's best generals, who died on the 30th March, 1663, on his way back to Dacca. It was also short-lived. A few years later the Āhoms reoccupied Kāmarūpa. The Mughul government carried on a long desultory warfare, but with no permanent advantage.

Shāista Khān, son of Āsaf Khan, and maternal uncle of Aurangzeb, was appointed governor of Bengal after the short and unsuccessful administration of an acting viceroy, which immediately followed the death of Mīr Jumla He held this post for about thirty years, with a break of less than three years, and died at Āgra in 1694, when he was more than ninety years old. He chastised the Portuguese pirates, annexed the island of Sondīp in the Bay of Bengal, which had been a stronghold of pirates, and conquered Chittagong (1666) from their ally, the King of Arākān. But the evil of piracy could not be wholly eradicated. It continued to harass the people of eastern Bengal till late in the eighteenth century.

4. The North-West Frontier Policy

Out of political and economic considerations, Aurangzeb had to follow a forward policy on the north-west frontier, where the turbulent Muslim tribes had all along proved a source of great anxiety to the Mughul Empire. The scanty produce of the fields of that region forced upon the growing numbers of the hardy

Afghān clans living there the habits of highway robbery and of blackmailing the rich cities of the north-western Punjab. In order to keep the north-western passes open and the valleys at their foot safe, the government of Aurangzeb first tried to win over these hillmen by payments of money. But "even political pensions were not always effective in securing obedience". Troubles began early in A.D 1667, when the Yūsufzāīs rose in arms under one of their leaders named Bhāgū. A large number of them crossed the Indus above Attock and invaded the Hazāra district, while other bands began to ravage the western Peshāwār and Attock districts. The Yūsufzāī rising was, however, suppressed in the course of a few months.

But in 1672 the Afrīdīs rose in revolt against the Mughuls under their chieftain Akmal Khān, who crowned himself king and summoned all the Pathāns to organise themselves in a sort of national war. In the month of May the insurgents inflicted a crushing defeat on Muhammad Āmin Khān at 'Ālī Masjid. Muhammad Āmin, and some of his senior officers, escaped, but the Mughuls lost everything else. This victory increased the prestige and resources of Akmal Khān and lured more recruits to his side so that "the whole of the Pathān land from Attock to Qandahār" rose in arms. The Khattak clan of the Pathāns also joined the Afrīdīs, and Khūsh-hāl Khān, the poet and hero of the former, "became the leading spirit of the national rising and inspired the tribesmen with his pen and sword alike". In February. 1674, the Afghāns assailed an imperial force under Shujā'at Khān, who was killed, though the remnant of his army was rescued by a Rāthor contingent, sent by Jaswant Singh to support the Mughuls.

This disaster convinced Aurangzeb that more serious efforts were necessary to restore imperial prestige in the north-west. He went in person to Hasan Abdāl, near Peshāwār, early in July, 1674, and by a clever combination of diplomacy and arms achieved much success. Many Afghān clans were bought over with presents, pensions, *jāgīrs*, and offices, while the more refractory ones were subdued by arms. When the situation had considerably improved, the Emperor left the Punjab for Delhi by December, 1675. The success of Aurangzeb was confirmed by the wise policy of Āmin Khān, the capable governor of Afghānistān from 1677 to 1698, who followed a tactful conciliatory policy under the wise advice of his wife, Sāhibjī, a daughter of 'Ālī Mardān Khān. Thus the Mughul Emperor was able to suppress the Afghān risings, and restore imperial prestige in the north-west, "by following the

policy of paying subsidies, or by setting up one clan against another—or, to use his own metaphor, breaking two bones by knocking them together". The Khattak hero, Khūsh-hāl, continued to fight for several years more, till his own son proved to be his worst enemy and betrayed him to the Mughuls.

There is no doubt that the frontier wars of the Mughuls were brought to a successful conclusion. But their indirect effects were prejudicial to the interests of the Empire. As Sir J. N. Sarkar observes: "Ruinous as the Afghān war was to imperial finances, its political effect was even more harmful. It made the employment of the Afghāns in the ensuing Rājput war impossible, though the Afghāns were just the class of soldiers who could have won victory in that rugged and barren country. Moreover, it relieved the pressure on Shivājī by draining the Deccan of the best Mughul troops for service on the north-west frontier. The Marātha chief took advantage of this division of his enemy's strength to sweep in a dazzling succession of triumphs through Golkundā to the Karnātak and back again through Mysore and Bijāpur to Rāigarh, during the fifteen months following December, 1675. It was the climax of his career; but the Afrīdīs and the Khattaks made his unbroken success possible."

5. Relations with the Muslim World outside India

Between 1661 and 1667 Aurangzeb received "complimentary embassies" from some foreign Muslim powers, such as the Sharif of Mecca, the Kings of Persia, Balkh, Bukhārā, Kāshghar, Urganj (Khiva) and Shahr-i-nau, the Turkish governors of Basra, Hadramaut, Yaman and Mocha, the ruler of Barbary, and the King of Abyssinia. From Constantinople only one embassy came during his reign, in June, 1590. "His policy at the beginning was," remarks Sir J. N. Sarkar, "to dazzle the eyes of foreign princes by the lavish gifts of presents to them and their envoys, and induce the outer Muslim world to forget his treatment of his father and brothers, or at least to show courtesy to the successful man of action and master of India's untold wealth, especially when he was free with his money."

6. Aurangzeb's Religious Attitude and Policy

Aurangzeb was above all a zealous Sunnī Muslim, and his religious policy was not influenced by any consideration of worldly gain. As one who secured the throne as the champion of Sunni

orthodoxy against the liberal Dārā, he tried to enforce strictly the Quranic law, according to which it behoves every pious Muslim to "exert himself in the path of God", or, in other words, to carry on holy wars (*jihād*) against non-Muslim lands (*dār-ul-harb*) till they are converted into realms of Islam (*dār-ul-Islām*). This made him extremely puritanic in temperament, so that he took several steps to enforce "his own ideas of the morose seriousness of life and punctilious orthodoxy". He simplified the customary celebrations on his birthday and coronation day. From the eleventh year of his reign he discontinued the practice of *Jharokā-darśan*, a practice by which his predecessors appeared every morning on the balcony on the wall of the palace to accept the salute of the people, who then gathered on the ground in front. In the same year he forbade music at court and dismissed the old musicians and singers. But music, though banned from the court, could not be "banished from the human soul". It continued to be secretly practised by the nobles, and the imperial prohibition had some force only in important cities. In the twelfth year the ceremony of weighing the Emperor's body on two birthdays against gold, silver and other commodities was given up, and royal astronomers and astrologers were dismissed. But the belief of the Muslims in astrology was too deeply rooted in their minds to be removed by an imperial ordinance; it remained active till late in the eighteenth century. In order to avoid the *Kalima* (Muhammadan confession of faith) on the coins being defiled by men of other faiths, he forbade its use. He also abolished the *Nauroz*, which the Mughul Emperors of India had borrowed from Persia. He appointed Censors of Public Morals (*Muhtasibs*) to "regulate the lives of the people in strict accordance with the Holy Law".

Aurangzeb personally practised what he sought to enforce on others. His private life was marked by a high standard of morality, and he scrupulously abstained from the common vices of his time. Thus he was regarded by his contemporaries as a "*darvish* born in the purple" and the Muslims venerated him as a "*Zindā Pīr*" or living saint. To "promote general morality", he issued a number of regulations. He passed an ordinance prohibiting the production, sale and public use, of wine and *bhāng*. Manucci tells us that the dancing girls and public women were ordered either to get themselves married or to leave the kingdom. The Emperor also passed strict orders against singing obscene songs, and stopped the burning of faggots and processions during certain religious festivals. It is mentioned in the official "guide-books" of Aurangzeb's reign that he forbade *Satī* (December, 1663), but "the evidence of

contemporary European travellers in India shows that the royal prohibition was seldom observed".

The Emperor, however, did not rest satisfied with these regulations only. He issued other *firmans* and ukases, which marked the inauguration of a new policy in regard to important sections of the people. The year 1679 saw the reimposition of the *jizya* tax on "unbelievers".

The new regulations and ordinances must have produced a deep impression on the people affected, and added much to the difficulties with which the imperial government had to deal. No one can deny the Emperor Aurangzeb the credit of being a sincere and conscientious exponent of the faith that was in him. But it is also true that his ardour and zeal made him oblivious of the fact that the country over which destiny had placed him to rule was not inhabited by a homogeneous population but included various elements rich in their religious traditions and ideals, which needed tactful and sympathetic understanding. Aurangzeb certainly made a mistake in identifying the interests of the State with those of his faith and in offending those who differed from it. This policy generated feelings of discontent among certain sections of the people, which by distracting his energies during the remainder of his reign proved to be one of the most potent causes of the decline and fall of the Mughul Empire.

7. Reaction against the New Policy

A. The Jāts, the Bundelās and the Satnāmīs

The first serious outbreak of anti-imperial reaction took place among the Jāts of the Muttrā (Mathurā) district, where the imperial *faujdār*, 'Abdun-Nabī, had oppressed them greatly. In 1669 the sturdy Jāt peasantry rose under a leader, Gokla, zamindār of Tilpat, killed the *faujdār*, and kept the whole district in disorder for a year, till they were suppressed by a strong imperial force under Hasan 'Alī Khān, the new *faujdār* of Muttrā. Gokla was put to death and the members of his family converted to Islam. But this did not crush the Jāts permanently. They rose once again in 1685 under the leadership of Rājā Rām and plundered Akbar's tomb at Sikandra in 1688. Rājā Rām was defeated and slain and the principal stronghold of the Jāts was reduced in 1691. But they soon found a more formidable leader in Churāman, who welded the disorganised Jāts into a strong military power and organised an armed resistance against the Mughuls after Aurangzeb's death

The second armed protest against Aurangzeb's policy was led by the Bundelā prince, Chhatrasāl. We have already traced the early relations of the Mughuls with the Bundelās. Chhatrasāl's father, Champat Rāi, had risen against Aurangzeb during the early part of his reign, but hard pressed by the Emperor, he committed suicide to escape imprisonment. Chhatrasāl had served the Emperor in the Deccan, where, inspired by the example of Shivājī, he "dreamt of taking to a life of adventure and independence". The discontent of the Hindu population of Bundelkhand and Mālwa gave him the opportunity to stand forth "as the champion" of his faith and Bundelā liberty by 1671. He gained several victories over the Mughuls, and succeeded in carving out an independent principality for himself in Eastern Mālwa with its capital at Panna, before his death in 1731.

Another revolt occurred in March, 1672, among the Satnāmīs, who were originally an inoffensive sect of Hindu devotees with their centres at Nārnol (in the Patiāla State) and Mewāt (Ālwar region). Khāfī Khān writes of them: "These men dress like devotees, but they nevertheless carry on trade and agriculture, though their trade is on a small scale. In the way of their religion, they have dignified themselves with the title of 'Good name', this being the meaning of Satnām. They are not allowed to acquire wealth in any but a lawful calling. If any one attempts to wrong or oppress them by force, or by exercise of authority, they will not endure it. Many of them have weapons or arms." The immediate cause of the rising of the Satnāmīs was the murder of one of them by a Mughul foot-soldier. They occupied Nārnol, and when the situation proved to be serious the Mughul Emperor "ordered his tents to be brought out". The untrained Satnāmī peasants were soon overpowered by a large imperial force. "Very few of them escaped, and that tract of country was cleared" of them.

B. The Sikhs

The new imperial policy caused discontent among the Sikhs also. We may conveniently give here a short history of the Sikhs during the reigns of the predecessors of Aurangzeb before we deal with his relations with them. The Sikh community, destined to play an important part in the history of Modern India, came into being during the period of religious revival which marked the history of India in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It was originally founded as a religious sect by Guru Nānak, a religious preacher of saintly disposition, who emphasised the

fundamental truth underlying all religions, and the chief features of whose system were its "non-sectarian character" and its harmony with secular life. He died in 1539 after nominating one of his disciples, Angad (1539–1552), as his successor, excluding his two sons. Angad and the next Guru, Amardās (1552–1574), were men of high character. Amardās was succeeded in the Guru's office by his son-in-law, Rāmdās (1574–1581). Akbar, who had a great veneration for this Guru, granted him a plot of land at Amritsar containing a pool, which was enlarged and improved and on the side of which was constructed a famous Sikh temple. It was during Rāmdās' pontificate that the succession to the spiritual headship of the Sikhs became hereditary. The fifth Guru, Arjan Mal (1581–1606), was a man of great organising capacity. Under him the Sikh community grew in numbers and spread far and wide over the Punjab. He compiled the *Ādi Granth*, or "the First Sacred Book", as the original Sikh scripture is called, by collecting select verses from the works of his four predecessors as well as from those of the Hindu and Muhammadan saints who had appeared since the days of Jaidev. He did his best to consolidate the Church, and the prestige and wealth of the Guru increased considerably. As a contemporary remarked: "The Emperor (Akbar) and Kings bow before him. Wealth ever cometh to him." His predecessors had been content with the "fluctuating voluntary offerings" of their disciples, but Guru Arjan tried to organise the finances of his Church by introducing the system of a more or less compulsory "spiritual tribute" to be collected by a band of his agents called *masands*. The early Gurus were religious preachers and did not interfere in politics, but Guru Arjan expressed his good wishes for the rebel prince Khusrav. Jahāngīr, who had probably grown suspicious of the Guru for his great wealth and influence, tortured him to death in 1606 on a charge of treason. This must have offended the Sikhs, whose hostility to the Mughul Empire was not, however, openly manifested at this time. The next Guru, Har Govind (1606–1645), son of Arjan, was a man of warlike and adventurous spirit, and gathered a small army round him. He had to undergo imprisonment for some time in Gwālior for his refusal to pay the arrears of the fine that had been imposed on his father. He rose against Shāh Jahān and defeated an imperial army at Sangrāma near Amritsar in 1628. In 1634 he shifted his headquarters to Kiratpur in the Kāshmīr Hills, where he died in 1645 after nominating his younger grandson, Har Rāi (1644–1661), as his successor. Har Rāi was followed in the Guruship, after his death in 1661, by his second son, Har Kishan (1661–1664).

Nothing important happened during the regimes of these two Gurus, but "the fiscal policy of Arjan, and the armed system of his son, had already formed the Sikhs into a kind of separate state within the empire".

Har Kishan died in 1664, and after some quarrels about succession to the Guruship, Teg Bahādur, second son of Har Govind, the sixth Guru, was recognised as the spiritual head of the community by most of the Sikhs. He settled at Ānandpur, six miles from Kiratpur. He lived for a few months at Patna in Bihār, where his son, Guru Govind, was born (A.D. 1666). He joined Rājā Rām Singh, son of Mīrzā Rājā Jai Singh, in the Assam war (A.D. 1668), but soon returned to his original abode at Ānandpur and was drawn into hostilities with the imperial government. He protested against certain measures of the Emperor and encouraged the Brāhmaṇas of Kāshmīr to resist these. This was too much for Aurangzeb to tolerate. He caused the Sikh divine to be arrested and brought over to Delhi, where he was offered the choice between death and conversion. Teg Bahādur preferred his faith to his life and was executed after five days (A.D. 1675). Thus he gave his head but not his faith (*sir diā sar na diā*). The martyrdom of the Guru inspired the Sikhs with feelings of revenge against the Mughul Empire and made an open war inevitable. The son and successor of Teg Bahādur, Guru Govind, was one of the most remarkable personalities in Indian history. He set himself to the task of organising his followers with the thoroughness "of a Grecian law-giver". He instituted the custom of baptism (*Pahul*) by water stirred with a dagger. Those who accepted the new form of baptism were known as the Khalsa (pure) and were given the appellation of *Singhs* (lions). They had to wear the five *Ks— kes* (long hair), *kangha* (comb), *kripān* (sword), *kachcha* (short drawers), and *kara* (steel bracelet). They were not to show their backs to the foe in battle. They were ever to help the poor and the unfortunate. Guru Govind compiled a supplementary *Granth*, known as the *Daswen Padshah kā Granth* ('the Book of the Tenth Sovereign'). He fought against some neighbouring hill-princes and Mughul officers with remarkable courage and tenacity. It is said that he assisted Bāhādur in his contest for the throne, and subsequently proceeded with him to the Deccan. An Afghān fanatic stabbed him to death, towards the end of 1708, at Nandur on the banks of the Godāvarī.

C. The Rājput War

The comparatively minor anti-imperial risings were suppressed by Aurangzeb. But more formidable revolts, also originating as a sort of reaction against the Emperor's policy, produced disastrous consequences for his Empire. Failing to realise the value of the alliance of the Rājputs, who had previously contributed so much to the growth of the Empire, he introduced a change in the policy of the State towards them. Rājā Jay Singh of Amber, whom he considered to be a powerful leader of Rājput opposition against his own policy, lost his life in the Deccan in 1667.

The conquest of Mārwār next engaged his attention from more than one consideration. It occupied a position of strategic importance as controlling certain military and commercial routes from the Mughul capital to the rich cities and ports in Western India. Further, its position as a powerful military State in Northern India at that time was a standing annoyance to Aurangzeb. He suspected that its chief, Jaswant Singh, formerly a partisan of Dārā Shukoh, might stand forth as the leader of opposition to his policy.

The Emperor soon had a favourable opportunity to give effect to his designs against Mārwār. While commanding the Mughul frontier posts in the Khyber Pass and the Peshāwār district, Rājā Jaswant Singh died at Jamrūd on the 10th December, 1678. On hearing this news Aurangzeb forthwith took steps to annex Mārwār. He appointed there his own officers as *faujdār*, *qilādār*, *kotwāl* and *amīn*, and brought it under direct Mughul rule. The Rāthors, thrown into confusion and dismay by the death of their chief, failed to present any united national resistance. In the month of May, Indra Singh Rāthor, the chieftain of Nagor and grand-nephew of Jaswant, was recognised as the Rānā of Jodhpur on payment of a "succession fee" of thirty-six lacs of rupees. But he was nothing more than a nominal ruler, surrounded by Mughul officers.

Thus the Emperor's policy seemed to have been crowned with success. But Mārwār was not really subdued. Every Rājput house in that kingdom became determined to undo the imperial *coup de main*, and "a new factor now entered the scene to disturb and eventually to defeat the imperial policy". Already in the month of February, 1679, two posthumous sons of Jaswant were born at Lahore. One of them died soon after birth, but the other, Ajit Singh, survived and was taken to Delhi by the principal followers of his father, who requested the Emperor to recognise him as

heir to the deceased Rājā. But the Emperor offered to bring him up in his harem, or, according to another contemporary account, "the throne of Jodhpur was offered to Ajit on condition of his turning a Muslim". This extraordinary proposal of the Emperor severely wounded the feelings of the Rāthors, who vowed to sacrifice their lives rather than accept these terms. But devotion and reckless courage only could be of no avail against the organised strength of the imperialists. Luckily for the Rāthors, they had, at this critical moment, a worthy leader in Durgādās (a son of Jaswant's minister Askaran), "the flower of Rāthor chivalry".

In the history of Rājputāna, Durgādās is justly regarded as one of the immortals for his selfless devotion to the cause of his country in the face of terrible odds. "Mughul gold could not seduce, Mughul arms could not daunt, that constant heart. Almost alone among the Rāthors he displayed the rare combination of the dash and reckless valour of a Rājput soldier with the tact, diplomacy and organising power of a Mughul minister of state." A band of "death-loving" Rājputs rushed upon the imperial force that had been sent to seize the Rānīs and Ajit Singh, and, taking advantage of the prevailing confusion, Durgādās rode away with the intended victims, clad in male attire. He covered nine miles before the imperialists could overtake him, but here a small band of Rājputs under Ranchordās Jodha tried to hold back the pursuers as long as they could, and Durgādās was able to reach Jodhpur on the 23rd July, 1679, with the Rānīs and Ajit. Aurangzeb now called up heavy reinforcements from different provinces, and the three princes, Mu'azzam, 'A'zam and Akbar, were placed in command of separate divisions of the army. He himself marched to Ajmer in August, 1679, to direct the military operations. Jodhpur was captured and pillaged.

But this aggressive policy of the Mughul Emperor led the brave Sisodiās of Mewār to join the desperate Rāthors of Mārwār. Rānā Rāj Singh of Mewār was a relative of Ajit Singh, whose mother was a Sisodiā princess. He also considered that the annexation of Mārwār exposed Mewār to the danger of Mughul conquest. Further, the revival of the *jizya*, after many years, incensed him highly. Through the Rāthor–Sisodiā alliance, the Rājput war assumed the aspect of a national rising in defence of liberty.

Aurangzeb at once invaded Mewār, but the Rānā, considering it unwise to meet face to face the superior strength of the Mughuls, deserted the towns and hamlets of Mewār and retired with all his subjects to mountain fastresses after laying waste

the plains below. The Mughuls easily occupied Chitor. Sure of success, the Emperor started for Ajmer, leaving a strong force in Chitor under Prince Akbar. But he was soon disillusioned. The Rājputs carried on a guerilla warfare and fell on the Mughul outposts with so much courage that "the command of Mughul outposts went a-begging, captain after captain declining the dangerous honour and offering excuses". Emboldened by their successes, the Rajputs surprised the Mughul army under Prince Akbar in May, 1680, and carried off its provisions. Reduced to starvation, the imperial army stood "motionless through fear", as Prince Akbar complained. Holding Prince Akbar responsible for this discomfiture, the Emperor placed the command of the army at Chitor in the hands of Prince 'A'zam and sent Akbar to Mārwār.

Smarting under the disgrace of his removal, Prince Akbar dreamt of wresting the crown of Delhi from his father in alliance with the Rājputs, whose worth he must have sufficiently understood during his war with them. The Rājput chiefs pointed out to him how his father's policy was destroying the stability of the Mughul Empire, and hoping thus to "place a truly national king on the throne of Delhi they promised to back him with the armed strength of the two greatest Rājput clans, the Sisodiās and the Rāthors". With his army of about 70,000 men, "including the best blood of Rājputāna", Prince Akbar arrived near Ajmer on the 15th January, 1681. Auranzgeb's situation was then critical, as the two main divisions of his army were quartered near Chitor and the Rājsamudra lake. Had the Prince promptly utilised this "fine opportunity", the Emperor might have been caught at a disadvantage. But he whiled away his time in indolence and pleasure and thus allowed his shrewd father to make preparations to defend himself. By writing a letter to his rebellious son, which the Emperor contrived should reach the Rājputs, he led Akbar's allies to believe that the Mughul Prince was playing false with them. The stratagem of the Emperor proved successful, as the Rājput allies of Prince Akbar, suspecting treachery, deserted him and he hurriedly "rode away for dear life in the track of the Rājputs". The Rājputs, however, soon discovered the fraud played on them, and the chivalrous Rāthor chief, Durgādās, convinced of the Prince's innocence, gallantly saved him from his father's vengeance and escorted him, through Khāndesh and Baglāna, to the court of the Marātha king, Shambhūjī. But the self-indulgent successor of Shivāji could afford no effective aid to the fugitive Mughul prince, whose dream of an Indian Empire, "based on Hindu-Muslim reconciliation

and amity, remained an idle one". About six years later the disappointed Mughul prince set out for Persia, where he died in A.D. 1704.

Though Prince Akbar's rebellion could not change the ruler of Delhi, it gave great relief to the Rānā of Mewār, but his temporary success against the Mughuls caused great misery to his subjects. The sufferings of the Mughuls had also been considerable, and they could not gain any definite success against the Rājputs. These considerations led the Emperor and the Rānā, Jay Singh, son and successor of Rāj Singh, to conclude a treaty in June, 1681. The Rānā ceded a few districts in lieu of *jizya* and the Mughuls withdrew from Mewār. Mārwār, however, had to continue a "thirty years' war" before a peace was concluded on honourable terms. Under the able leadership of Durgādās, the Rāthors ceaselessly carried on a guerilla warfare and harassed the Mughul outposts so that the Mughul officers were compelled to pay *chauth* to their unrelenting foe to save themselves from his aggression. The war dragged on till, after Aurangzeb's death, his son and successor, Bahādur Shāh I, recognised Ajit Singh as the Rānā of Mārwār in A.D. 1709.

The Rājput wars of Aurangzeb produced disastrous consequences for his Empire. Thousands of lives were sacrificed and enormous sums were wasted on the desert land without any lasting success to the Emperor. "Damaging as this result was to imperial prestige, its material consequences were worse still." It was an act of political unwisdom on the part of Aurangzeb to provoke Rājput hostility and thus forfeit the devoted service of gallant chiefs and soldiers, so long friends of the Empire, in his wasting wars in the Deccan, or in the important work of holding under control the north-western frontier, where the restless Afghān tribes were still far from being pacified.

8. Aurangzeb and the Deccan

During the first half of Aurangzeb's reign his attention was engrossed with affairs in the north, and the Deccan was left to the viceroys. The decadent southern Sultānates had not been able to recover fully from the blows that had been inflicted on them, and the Marāthas rose at their expense. The rise of the Marāthas, as a sort of challenge to the Mughul Empire, complicated the political situation in the Deccan, the full significance of which the Emperor could not realise at first. During the first twenty-four years of his reign his viceroys in the Deccan could

achieve no definite success either against the Sultānates or against the Marāthas.

The death of Shivājī in 1680 in no way improved the imperial position in the Deccan, notwithstanding Aurangzeb's determination to consolidate his supremacy. The flight of the rebellious Prince Akbar to the Marātha king, Shambhūji, and the alliance between the "disturber of India" and the "infernal son of the infernal father", as Aurangzeb called these two, brought a complete change in his policy towards the Deccan. Having now realised the necessity of marching there in person to check this menace to imperial interests, he patched up a peace with Mewār in June, 1681. Leaving Ajmer for the Deccan on the 8th September, 1681, he arrived at Burhānpur on 23rd November, 1681, and at Ahmadnagar on the 1st April, 1682. His mind must have been full of high hopes, and he could not foresee that destiny was dragging him to the south to dig the graves of himself and his Empire. The first four years were spent in unsuccessful attempts to seize Prince Akbar and in rather disastrous campaigns against the Marāthas. Some of the forts of the latter were conquered by the imperialists, but the sturdy folk whom Shivājī had inspired with new aspirations could not be thoroughly suppressed.

The conquest of the decayed Sultānates next engaged the Emperor's attention. As in the case of Shāh Jahān, Aurangzeb's attitude towards the Shiah Sultānates of the Deccan was influenced partly by imperial interests and partly by religious considerations. Bijāpur, weakened by party factions and the rise of the Marāthas, submitted to the invaders. The last Mughul siege of the city began on the 11th April, 1685, and the Emperor himself went there in July, 1686. The besieged garrison held out gallantly but, exhausted by lack of provisions and the death of countless men and horses, caused by the outbreak of a famine, they capitulated in September, 1686. Sikandar, the last of the 'Ādil Shāhīs, surrendered to the Emperor and the dynasty founded by Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh ceased to exist. On entering Bijāpur the Emperor destroyed all the fine paintings and frescoes in Sikandar's palace. Bijāpur not only lost its independence, but was turned into a desolate city. "A few years later," writes Sir J. N. Sarkar, "Bhīmsen noticed how the city and its equally large suburb Nauraspur looked deserted and ruined; the population was scattered, and even the abundant water-supply in the city wells had suddenly grown scanty."

Next came the turn of the Qutb Shāhī kingdom of Golkundā. Early in February, 1687, Aurangzeb himself appeared before

Golkundā and the Mughul troops besieged the local fortress within a few days. But the citadel was well stocked with food and ammunition, which enabled the besieged to hold out bravely for about eight months. In spite of using every possible means—mines, bombardments and escalades—the besiegers could achieve no definite success but were harassed by famine and pestilence and incurred heavy losses from the reprisals of their enemies. Aurangzeb, however, held on with grim tenacity and gathered fresh reinforcements. On the failure of valour and arms, Aurangzeb, following the example of Akbar before Asīrgarh, made use of "the golden key" to capture Golkundā. An Afghān soldier of fortune named 'Abdullah Pani, then employed in the service of Abul Hasan, the Sultān of Golkundā, was suborned by the Emperor and allowed the Mughuls to pour into the fort by opening its main gate. But one faithful Golkundā noble, 'Abdur Razzāq Lārī, spurned the Emperor's tempting offers of money and fought single-handed till he fell covered with seventy wounds. He was nursed back to recovery by the Mughuls and at last accepted a high rank under the Emperor. 'Abul Hasan was sent off to the fortress of Daulatābād to spend his last days on a pension of Rs. 50,000 a year, and Golkundā was annexed (September, 1687) to the Mughul Empire.

According to writers like Elphinstone and Smith, the annihilation of the Southern Sultānates was an impolitic step on the part of Aurangzeb. They hold that it "freed the Marātha chiefs from any fear of local rivalry", which the Mughul Emperor might have utilised to his advantage against the Marāthas. But it is doubtful if any sincere alliance between the Sultānates and their aggressor, the Mughul Emperor, was possible and also if they could check the rise of the Marāthas. As Sir J. N. Sarkar observes, "since Akbar had crossed the Vindhyas, the Deccan Sultānates could never forget that the sleepless aim of the Mughul Emperors was the final extinction and annexation of all their territories". He also points out that it would have been impossible for the decadent Sultānates to check the Marāthas effectively as they had already organised themselves into a progressive national State.

Having achieved one of the two objects of his Deccan policy, that is, the annexation of the decadent Sultānates of the Deccan, Aurangzeb turned towards the other, that is, the suppression of the renascent Marātha power. His attempts were at first crowned with success. Shambhūjī was executed on the 11th March, 1689, his capital Rāigarh was captured, and though his brother, Rājārām, escaped, the rest of his family, including his young son,

Shāhū, were made prisoners. In the course of the next few years the Emperor extended his conquests further south and levied tribute on the Hindu States of Tanjore and Trichinopoly.

In fact by the year 1690 Aurangzeb had already reached the zenith of his power and was the lord paramount of almost the whole of India—from Kābul to Chittagong and from Kāshmīr to the Kāverī. "All seemed to have been gained by Aurangzeb now; but in reality all was lost. It was the beginning of his end. The saddest and most hopeless chapter of his life was now opened. The Mughul Empire had become too large to be governed by one man or from one centre. . . . His enemies rose on all sides; he could defeat but not crush them for ever. . . . Lawlessness reigned in many places of Northern and Central India. The old Emperor in the far-off Deccan lost all control over his officers in Hindustān, and the administration grew slack and corrupt; chiefs and zamindārs defied the local authorities and asserted themselves, filling the country with tumult. In the province of Āgra in particular, there was chronic disorder. Art and learning decayed at the withdrawal of Imperial patronage; not a single edifice, finely written manuscript, or exquisite picture, commemorates Aurangzeb's reign. The endless war in the Deccan exhausted his treasury; the government turned bankrupt, the soldiers, starving from arrears of pay, mutinied; and during the closing years of his reign the revenue of Bengal, regularly sent by the able *diwān* Murshid Qulī Khān, was the sole support of the Emperor's household or his army, and its arrival was eagerly looked forward to. Napoleon I used to say, 'It was the Spanish ulcer which ruined me'. The Deccan ulcer ruined Aurangzeb." The Emperor failed to subjugate the Marāthas or conquer their land. They recovered by 1691 and carried on a war of national resistance against the Mughuls, first under Rājārām and some other able Marātha chiefs, and then, after Rājārām's death in 1700, under his brave widow Tārā Bāī.

9. Last Days of Aurangzeb

Thus, as years rolled on, Aurangzeb saw before his eyes failure piled upon failure and his Empire exhausted. Fear for the future of the Empire filled his mind with anguish, and made him extremely unhappy. His advice to his rebellious sons to save the Empire by partition went unheeded. Conscious of his failure and seriously apprehensive of the imminent disaster, he wrote to his son 'A'zam: "I came alone and am going alone. I have not done well to the country and the people, and of the future there is no hope." To

Kām Bakhsh he wrote: "I carry away the burden of my shortcomings. . . . Come what may, I am launching my boat." The deep pathos of these letters is bound to move every human heart and to rouse in it sympathy for the old monarch on his "lonely death-bed". Worn out in mind and body by heavy cares and hard toil, the Emperor died at Ahmadnagar in the morning of the 3rd March, 1707, "with the Muslim confession of faith on his lips". His body was carried to Daulatābād and was interred in the compound of the tomb of the famous Muslim saint Burhān-ud-dīn.

10. Aurangzeb as a Man and a Ruler

To judge the character and policy of a personality like Aurangzeb is indeed a perplexing task. Some have taken into consideration mainly his faults, and not his good qualities, which they have mostly ignored. There is no reason why he should be singled out for severe strictures for the manner in which he secured the throne. In this, he was simply following the example that had become almost traditional in the Tīmūrīd family in India. It would be unjust to throw on him the entire responsibility for the war of succession; it would have come at any rate, as none of the brothers was willing to make any compromise. It should not be forgotten that while Shāh Jahān removed all his possible rivals Aurangzeb did not put to death all his nephews. It is indeed hard to defend Aurangzeb's harsh treatment of his old father, but in justice to him it should be noted that at least he was not a parricide, of which we find numerous instances in the history of India and of other countries.

Aurangzeb's private life was simple, pious and austere. He was not a slave to his passions and scrupulously abstained from indulging in prohibited food, drink or dress. The number of his wives "fell short even of the Quranic allowance of four", which was a praiseworthy restraint for an Emperor in those days, though it was below the standard of Dārā Shukoh and Khusrav. He was an ardent student of Muslim theology, and an expert calligraphist, and tried to "educate his children in sacred lore". But it is a pity that he seldom encouraged art and letters. The only literary production which received his patronage was the *Fatāwa-i-'Ālamgīrī*, which has been regarded as "the greatest digest of Muslim law made in India". Aurangzeb was a pious Muslim, and with the zeal of a Puritan he scrupulously observed the injunctions of the Holy Quran. Once during the Balkh campaign he knelt down to finish his prayers at the proper time, though the fighting

was going on all around him. No one can deny him the credit of being sincere in his religious convictions. But this extreme puritanism made him stern and austere and dried up the springs of the tender qualities of heart. He thus "lacked sympathy, imagination, breadth of vision, elasticity in the choice of means, which atone for a hundred faults of the head".

Undaunted bravery, grim tenacity of purpose, and ceaseless activity, were some of his prominent qualities. His military campaigns give sufficient proof of his unusual courage, and the manner in which he baffled the intrigues of his enemies shows him to have been a past-master of diplomacy and state-craft. His memory was wonderful, and his industry indefatigable. He personally read all petitions and passed orders on them with his own hand. The Italian physician Gemelli-Careri, who visited India during the reign of Aurangzeb and saw him in 1695 when he was seventy-seven years old, "admired to see him endorse the petitions with his own hand, without spectacles, and by his cheerful, smiling countenance seemed to be extremely pleased with the employment".

In spite of his vitality and strength of character, Aurangzeb, as a ruler of India, proved to be a failure. He hardly realised that the greatness of an Empire depends on the progress of its people as a whole. In the intensity of his religious zeal he ignored the feelings of important sections of the people and thus roused forces hostile to his Empire. Indeed, the history of India since the days of the Mauryas clearly shows that political progress in this land is dependent on the policy of religious toleration which would seek to create harmony in the midst of various discordant elements. To build up a united India, while accentuating religious differences, is bound to remain an idle dream. Further, Aurangzeb's plodding industry and capacity for work in one sense went against him by implanting in his mind a sense of over-confidence, and excessive distrust of his officers. This led him to interfere constantly in the minutest affairs of the State. It resulted in keeping the local officers in a state of perpetual tutelage, and crushing their initiative, sense of responsibility, and efficiency, which could not but produce "administrative degeneration in an extensive and diversified empire like India". Khāfī Khān gives the following estimate of the Emperor from the point of view of an orthodox Sunnī: "Of all the sovereigns of the House of Tīmūr —nay of all the sovereigns of Delhi—no one, since Sikandar Lodī, has ever been apparently so distinguished for devotion, austerity and justice. In courage, long-suffering and sound judgment, he was unrivalled. But from reverence of the injunction of the Law

he did not make use of punishment, and without punishment the administration of a country cannot be maintained. Dissensions had arisen among his nobles through rivalry. So every plan and project that he formed came to little good and every enterprise which he undertook was long in execution and failed of its object." Aurangzeb had many sterling qualities; but he was not a successful ruler; he was a great soldier but not a farseeing leader of men, a shrewd diplomat but not a sound statesman. In short, he was not a political genius, such as Akbar alone among the Mughuls had been, who could initiate a policy and enact laws to mould the life and thought of his contemporaries or of future generations. Largely owing to the Emperor's lack of political foresight, the symptoms of the disintegration of the Mughul Empire appeared before he left this world. His weak successors only hastened the process of decay. The reign of the puritan Emperor was a great tragedy.

11. The Marāthas and the Mughuls in the Seventeenth Century

A. Rise of the Marāthas

The rise of the Marātha power introduced an important factor in Indian politics during the second half of the seventeenth century, as that of Vijayanagar had done in a previous age. The Marāthas had brilliant traditions of political and cultural activities in the early Middle Ages of Indian history, when they upheld the national cause under the Yādavas of Devagiri. They lost their independence with the fall of the Yādava Rāmchandradeva in the time of 'Ālā-ud-dīn, but in forty years they began again to play an important part in the Bahmanī kingdom and subsequently in the succeeding Sultānates. The seventeenth century saw them organised into a national State. There is no doubt that Shivājī was the hero of this Marātha national unity, but it has to be noted that the ground was prepared for his glorious achievements by several other factors.

Firstly, the geography of Mahārāshtra exercised a profound influence in moulding the character and history of its people. Enclosed on two sides by mountain ranges like the Sahyadrī running from north to south, and the Sātpura and the Vindhya running from east to west, protected by the Narmadā and the Tāptī rivers and provided with numerous easily defensible hill-forts, the Marātha country "could not be annexed or conquered by one cavalry dash or even one year's campaigning". The

rugged and unproductive soil of the land, its precarious and scanty rainfall, and its meagre agricultural resources, kept the Marāthas immune from the vices of luxury and idleness and helped them to develop the virtues of "self-reliance, courage, perseverance, a stern simplicity, a rough straight-forwardness, a sense of social equality, and consequently pride in the dignity of man as man". Secondly, the Marāthī religious reformers, Ekanāth, Tukārām, Rāmdās and Vāman Pandit, preaching, through successive centuries, the doctrines of devotion to God and of equality of all men before Him, without any distinction of caste or position, and the dignity of action, had sown in their land the seeds of a renaissance or self-awakening which is generally the presage of a political revolution in a country. Rāmdās Samarth, Guru of Shivājī, exerted a profound influence on the minds of his countrymen and inspired them with ideals of social reform and national regeneration through his disciples in *maths* (monasteries) and his famous work known as *Dasabodha*. Thirdly, literature and language supplied another bond of union among the sons of Mahārāshtra. The devotional songs of religious reformers were composed in the Marāthī language, and consequently a forceful Marāthī literature grew up during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries to inspire the people of the land with noble aspirations. "Thus," observes Sir J. N. Sarkar, "a remarkable community of language, creed and life was attained in Mahārāshtra in the seventeenth century even before political unity was conferred by Shivājī. What little was wanting to the solidarity of the people was supplied by his creation of a national State, the long struggle with the invader from Delhi under his sons, and the imperial expansion of the race under the Peshwās."

The Marāthas had also acquired some previous experience of political and military administration through their employment in the Sultānates of the Deccan. Shāhjī, father of the famous Shivājī, began his career as a trooper in the army of the Sultān of Ahmadnagar. He gradually rose to distinction, acquired vast territorial possessions in that State, and played the kingmaker during the last years of the Nizām Shāhī rule. But his success excited the jealousy of others, and after the annexation of Ahmadnagar by Shāh Jahān, he entered the service of the Bijāpur State in 1636. Here also he earned considerable fame and received an extensive fief in the Karnātak, besides his old *jāgīr* of Poona, which he had held as a servant of the Ahmadnagar State.

B. Shivāji's Career

Shivāji was born in the hill-fort of Shivner near Junnar in 1630, as the writers of one school hold, or in 1627, as some modern historians say.[1] Shāhji removed to his new *jāgīr* with his second wife, leaving Shivāji and his mother Jijā Bāi under the guardianship of an able Brāhmaṇa, Dādāji Khonddev. Neglected by her husband, Jijā Bāi, a lady of virtuous temperament and extraordinary intellect, infused into her child's mind high and inspiring ideas by reciting stories of heroism, spirituality and chivalry in past ages, and stimulated his zeal in defence of religion. "If ever great men owed their greatness to the inspiration of mothers", wrote Ranade, "the influence of Jijā Bāi was a factor of prime importance in the making of Shivāji's career." The influence of Dādāji Khonddev also combined to make him bold and enterprising. We do not know if Shivāji received any formal literary education, but he grew up as a brave and adventurous soldier, "inspired by a real desire to free his country from what he considered to be a foreign tyranny, and not by a mere love of plunder". His early intimacy with the hillmen of the Māval country, ninety miles in length and about twelve to fourteen miles in breadth along the Western Ghāts, was of immense value to him in his subsequent years, as the Māvalis turned out to be "his best soldiers, his earliest comrades, and his most devoted commanders". Through his mother, he was descended from the Yādava rulers of Devagiri, and on his father's side he claimed descent from the brave Sisodiās of Mewār. Thus the sentiment of glorious heredity, and the influence of early training and environment, combined to rouse in the young Marātha soldier aspirations for founding an independent kingdom. He chose for himself a "career of independence", which, though full of risk, "had undreamt-of advantages to compensate for the risk, if only he could succeed".

The growing weakness of the Deccan Sultānates, and the prolonged campaigns of the imperialists in the north, greatly favoured the rise of the Marātha power. In 1646 Shivāji captured the fortress of Torna, five miles east of which he soon built the fort of Rājgarh. After the death of Dādāji Khonddev (1647), who probably did not approve of these risky enterprises, Shivāji acquired many forts from their hereditary owners, or the local officers of Bijāpur, by

[1] Sarkar's *Shivāji*, p. 25; *J.I.H.*, 1927, pp. 177–97. Mr. Dasaratha Sharma has brought to light (*J.B.O.R.S.*, June, 1934) a contemporary record of Shivāji's birth (that is, a horoscope of Shivāji preserved in the Bikāner Fort Library), according to which Shivāji was born in *Samvat* 1686.

force, bribery or trickery, and also built new ones. He thus came to possess a considerable estate, protected by a long chain of hill-forts. He had to suspend offensive operations against Bijāpur for a few years (1649–1655) as his father was put under arrest by the Bijāpur Government and was released on condition of his son's good behaviour. But he utilised this time in consolidating his conquests, and in January, 1656, annexed the small Marātha principality of Jāvlī, by having its semi-independent Marātha prince, Chandra Rāo More, done to death by one of his agents. The extent and revenue of Shivājī's heritage were by this time more than doubled. He came into conflict with the Mughuls for the first time in 1657, when, taking advantage of Aurangzeb and his troops being engaged in the invasion of Bijāpur, he raided the Mughul districts of Ahmadnagar and Junnar and even looted the city of Junnar. Aurangzeb promptly reinforced his officers in that part and Shivājī was defeated. When 'Ādil Shāh concluded peace with Aurangzeb, Shivājī also submitted to him. Aurangzeb never trusted Shivājī, but he patched up the peace as his presence in the north became necessary owing to his father's illness. Shivājī next turned his attention to the North Konkān, captured Kalyān, Bhiwāndī and Māhulī, and proceeded as far south as Māhad.

Temporarily relieved from internal strife and immediate Mughul invasion, the Sultān of Bijāpur decided to destroy the power of Shivājī once for all, and sent a large force against him, early in A.D. 1659, under Afzal Khān, one of the foremost nobles and generals of the kingdom, "to bring back the rebel (Shivājī) dead or alive". Afzal Khān reached Wai, twenty miles north of Sātārā, within a fortnight. Failing to bring Shivājī out of his stronghold of Pratāpgarh, the Bijāpur general opened negotiations with him through a Marātha Brāhmaṇa, named Kṛishṇajī Bhāskar, and invited him to a conference. Shivājī received the envoy with respect, and appealed to him in the name of religion to disclose the real intention of Afzal Khān. Moved by this, Kṛishṇajī Bhāskar hinted that the Bijāpur general had mischief in his mind, which was confirmed by what Shivājī learnt from Gopināth, his own envoy to Afzal. This put Shivājī on the alert, and he proceeded to meet his adversary in a conference, apparently unarmed but with concealed weapons and clad in armour, with a view to meeting craft with craft if necessary. It has been unanimously alleged by the Marāthas that, as the two embraced each other, the strong and stalwart Muslim general held the short and slim Marātha chief's neck in his left arm with "an iron grip" and with his right hand tried to thrust a dagger into the body of Shivājī, whose hidden armour,

however, saved him from harm. Shivājī immediately killed Afzal by rending his body with his *bāghnakh* or gloves with steel claws. With the help of his troops, who were lying in ambush, he defeated the leaderless Bijāpur troops and plundered their camp. Khāfī Khan and Duff charge Shivājī with having treacherously murdered Afzal Khān, who, in their opinion, did not first try to strike Shivājī. But Marātha writers have justified Shivājī's treatment of Afzal as an act of self-defence against the attack of the Bijāpur general. The contemporary factory records accord with the statement of the Marātha chroniclers.

Shivājī next entered the South Konkan and the Kolhāpur district. But in July, 1660, he was invested in the Panhālā fort by a Bijāpur force under Sīdī Jauhar and was forced to evacuate it. He was soon confronted with a new danger. Shāista Khān, the new Mughul governor of the Deccan, commissioned by Aurangzeb to suppress the Marātha chief's activities, occupied Poona, captured the fort of Chākan and drove away the Marāthas from the Kalyān district. But Shivājī soon patched up a truce with the Bijāpur State, through the intervention of his father, who still held a position of importance there. Thus he became free to turn his whole attention to the Mughuls. After about two years' desultory fighting, he secretly entered into Shāista Khān's apartments in Poona with some attendants on the 15th April, 1663, "surprised and wounded the Mughul viceroy of the Deccan in the heart of his camp, in his very bed-chamber, within the inner ring of his body-guards and female slaves", slew his son, Abul Fath, one captain, forty attendants and six women of his harem, and then went safely away to the neighbouring stronghold of Singhagarh. The Mughul viceroy lost his thumb and barely escaped with his life. This daring exploit immensely increased the prestige of Shivājī, who soon performed another feat, not less adventurous than the one described above. During the period 16th—20th January, 1664, he attacked and sacked Surāt, the richest seaport on the west, without hindrance, as the governor of the place had taken to his heels instead of opposing him. The Marātha chief decamped with rich plunder exceeding ten million rupees in value. Only the local English and Dutch factories successfully resisted him and escaped being plundered.

Indignant at these repeated reverses, which greatly affected Mughul prestige and influence in the Deccan, Aurangzeb sent, early in 1665, Jay Singh, Rājā of Amber, and Dilīr Khān to the Deccan with an expeditionary force to punish Shivājī. Jay Singh, a tactful and brave general, who combined with varied military

experience, gained during his campaigns in different parts of the Empire, much diplomatic skill and foresight, proceeded cautiously against the clever Marātha chief. Raising a ring of enemies round Shivājī, he besieged the fort of Purandhar. The beleaguered garrison in the fort maintained a heroic resistance for some time, during which its "Prabhu" commander, Munar Bājī Deshpānde of Māhad, lost his life with 300 Māvlīs. The Mughuls also blockaded Rājgarh, the seat of Shivājī's government. Considering the cost of further resistance, Shivājī concluded the treaty of Purandhar with Jay Singh on the 22nd June, 1665, whereby he ceded to the Mughuls twenty-three of his forts, retaining only twelve for himself, promised to supply a contingent of 5,000 cavalry to act with the Mughul army in the Deccan, and was permitted to compensate himself for his territorial losses by collecting *chauth* and *sardeshmukhī* in some districts of the Bijāpur kingdom. He soon joined the imperialists in a war against Bijāpur. But Jay Singh's Bijāpur campaign ended in failure. He, however, plied Shivājī "with high hopes", and using "a thousand devices" prevailed upon him to visit the imperial court at Āgra.

Jay Singh's object in sending Shivājī to the imperial court was to remove him from the troubled area of the Deccan, but it is very difficult to understand what led Shivājī to agree to his proposal. Mr. Sardesai writes that the consideration which led Shivājī to go to the imperial court was his desire to see with his own eyes the Emperor, his court, and the sources of his strength, with a view to preparing his plans for future operations against him properly. We know, on the other hand, that Jay Singh had to persuade him to take such a risky step by holding out promises of reward and honour and taking solemn oaths to be responsible for his safety at Āgra. To secure the consent of the Emperor to the occupation of the island of Janjīra, then held by the Sīddī, an imperial servant, might have also been an objective of the Marātha chief. With the assurance of the astrologers and concurrence of the majority of his officers, he started for Āgra with his son, Shambhūjī, and reached there on the 9th May, 1666.

But Shivājī was coldly received by Aurangzeb and ranked as a noble commanding 5,000 men, which wounded his sense of honour so much that he created a scene and swooned. On being restored to his senses, he accused the Emperor of breach of faith, whereupon he was placed under guard. Thus his "high hopes were dashed to pieces and he found himself a prisoner instead". An ordinary man would have given way to despair under such

trying circumstances, but, being gifted with extraordinary resourcefulness, he resorted to a stratagem to effect his escape. Pretending to recover from his feigned illness, he began sending out of his house every evening baskets of fruits and sweetmeats for Brāhmaṇas, mendicants and nobles, as thanksgiving offerings for his fictitious recovery. After a few days, when the guards had relaxed their vigilance and allowed the baskets to go out unchecked, Shivājī and his son concealed themselves in two empty baskets and slipped out of Āgra, eluding all the spies of the Mughul Emperor. He

RĀIGARH FORT

hastened with Shambhūjī to Muttrā and, leaving his fatigued son there in charge of a Marātha Brāhmaṇa, reached home, in the guise of a mendicant, on the 30th November, 1666, by following a roundabout way, via Allahābād, Benares, Gayā and Telingāna.

For three years after this, Shivājī remained at peace with the Mughuls and utilised the period in organising his internal administration. Aurangzeb granted him the title of *Rājā* and a *jāgīr* in Berar, and raised his son Shambhūjī to the rank of a noble of 5,000. But war was renewed in 1670. The position of the imperialists being weaker than before, owing to a bitter quarrel between the viceroy,

Shāh 'Ālam, and his lieutenant, Dilīr Khān, Shivājī recovered almost all the forts surrendered by him in 1665. In the month of October, 1670, he sacked Surāt for the second time and captured immense booty in cash and kind. He then carried daring raids into Mughul provinces and repeatedly defeated Mughul generals in open fight. In 1672 he demanded *chauth* from Surāt.

The tribal risings in the north-west then engaged Aurangzeb's attention more than anything else, and a part of the Mughul army was transferred from the Deccan to that region. The desultory fighting of the Mughul captains against Shivājī from 1672 to 1678 led to no success. The Marātha hero was then in the full tide of power. On the 16th June, 1674, he formally crowned himself king at Rāigarh with great pomp and splendour, and assumed the title of *Chhatrapati* (Lord of the Umbrella, or king of kings).

Besides being relieved of pressure from the Mughuls, owing to their preoccupations in the north-west, Shivājī secured the friendship of the Sultān of Golkundā, and conquered in one year (1677) Jinjī, Vellore, and the adjoining districts. These greatly enhanced his prestige and gave him the possession of a vast territory in the Madras Carnatic and the Mysore plateau, covering sixty leagues by forty, yielding him an annual revenue of 20 lacs of *huns* and containing 100 forts. His successful career came to a close with his premature death at the age of fifty-three (or fifty, according to some) on the 14th April, 1680. Shivājī's kingdom extended roughly along the entire coast from Rāmnagar (modern Dharampur State in the Surāt Agency) in the north to Kārwār in the south, excluding the Portuguese, African and English settlements of Damān, Salsette, Bassein, Chaul, Goa, Janjīra and Bombay. On the east, its boundary ran in an irregular line from Baglāna in the north, through the Nāsik and Poona districts and round the whole of Sātārā, to Kolhāpur in the south. His last conquests brought within the limits of his dominions the Western Carnatic, extending from Belgaum to the banks of the Tuṅgabhadrā, opposite to the Bellary district of the modern Madras Presidency, and also a large part of the present kingdom of Mysore.

C. Shivāji's Government

Shivājī was not merely a daring soldier and a successful military conqueror, but also an enlightened ruler of his people. As Mr. Rawlinson observes: "Like nearly all great warriors—Napoleon is a conspicuous example—Shivājī was also a great administrator, for the qualities which go to make a capable general are those

which are required by the successful organiser and statesman. His system, like that of the Muslim rulers of India, was an autocracy, of which he himself was the supreme head. But in the actual discharge of State business he was helped by a council of eight ministers—the *ashtapradhān*—whose functions were chiefly advisory. The eight ministers were: (i) The *Peshwā* or the Prime Minister who had to look after the general welfare and interests of the kingdom, (ii) the *Amātya* or the Finance Minister, whose duty was to check and countersign all public accounts, (iii) the *Mantrī*, who had to preserve a daily record of the king's acts and the proceedings of his court, (iv) the *Sachiva* or the superintendent, who was in charge of the king's correspondence and had also to check the accounts of the *mahāls* and *paraganās*, (v) the *Sumant* or the Foreign Secretary, (vi) the *Senāpati* or the Commander-in-chief, (vii) the *Pandit Rāo* and *Dānādhyaksha* or the Royal Chaplain and Almoner, and (viii) the *Nyāyādhīsa* or the Chief Justice. All the ministers, excepting the *Nyāyādhīsa* and the *Pandit Rāo*, held military commands besides their civil duties, and at least three of them were placed in charge of provincial administration as well. The ministers were in charge of different departments of the State, which were no less than thirty in number. Shivājī divided his kingdom into a number of provinces, each being placed under a viceroy, who held office at the king's pleasure and was assisted like him by a staff of eight chief officers. The viceroy of the Karnātak had a position somewhat different from that of the other provincial governors, and he exercised more power and discretion.

For purposes of revenue collection and administration, Shivājī's kingdom was divided into a number of *prants* or provinces. Each *prant* was subdivided into *paraganās* and *tarfs*, and the village formed the lowest unit. Shivājī abandoned the existing practice of farming out land revenue and substituted for it direct collection from the ryots through State officials, who had "no right to exercise the powers of a political superior (overlord) or harass the ryots". The assessment was made after a careful survey of lands, for which purpose a uniform unit of measurement was introduced. The State dues were fixed at 30 per cent of the expected produce, which was after some time raised by Shivājī to 40 per cent after he had abolished other kinds of taxes or cesses. The cultivators knew definitely the amount of their dues, which they could pay without any oppression. They were given the choice of payment either in cash or in kind. The State encouraged agriculture by granting advance loans from the treasury to the ryots for the purchase of

seed and cattle, and the latter repaid these by easy annual instalments. It is wrong to say, as Fryer has done, that the State officers practised extortions and oppressions on the cultivators, though it might have been that Shivājī, with a view to making his kingdom financially sound, was strict in the matter of revenue collection. Modern researches have amply proved that the revenue administration of Shivājī was humane, efficient, and conducive to the interests of his subjects, as even Grant Duff admitted many years ago.

As the hilly regions of Mahārāshtra did not yield much in land revenue, Shivājī often levied *chauth* and *sardeshmukhī* on the neighbouring tracts, which were completely at his mercy, and also on the Mughul provinces as well as some districts of the Bijāpur kingdom. The practice of levying *chauth* had already been in vogue in western India, as we find that the Rājā of Rāmnagar exacted it from the Portuguese subjects of Damān. Scholars differ in their opinions regarding the nature of the *chauth* contribution. Ranade, who compares it with Wellesley's subsidiary system, writes that it was "not a mere military contribution without any moral or legal obligation, but a payment in lieu of protection against the invasion of a third power". Sir J. N. Sarkar expresses a different opinion when he writes: "The payment of the *chauth* merely saved a place from the unwelcome presence of the Marātha soldiers and civil underlings, but did not impose on Shivājī any corresponding obligation to guard the district from foreign invasion or internal disorder. The Marāthas looked only to their own gain and not to the fate of their prey after they had left. The *chauth* was only a means of buying off one robber; and not a subsidiary system for the maintenance of peace and order against all enemies. The lands subject to the *chauth* cannot, therefore, be rightly called spheres of influence." According to Mr. Sardesai, it was a tribute realised from hostile or conquered territories. Dr. Sen writes that the *chauth* was a contribution exacted by a military leader, which was justified by the exigencies of the situation. Whatever might be the theory of this burdensome imposition, which amounted to one-fourth of the government revenue, in practice it was nothing but a military contribution. The *sardeshmukhī* was an additional levy of 10 per cent, which Shivājī demanded on the basis of his claim as the hereditary *Sardeshmukh* (chief headman) of Mahārāshtra. But this was a legal fiction. The exaction of *chauth* and *sardeshmukhī* gave to the Marāthas influence over the districts which lay beyond their jurisdiction and was followed by their easy annexation.

The organisation of the Marātha army by Shivājī on a new model is a brilliant proof of his military genius. Previously the Marātha fighting forces consisted mostly of cavalry, who had been in the habit of working half the year upon their fields, and engaged themselves during the dry season in active service. Shivājī, however, introduced a regular standing army. His soldiers had to be always ready for duty, and were provided with pay and quarters during the rainy season. The strength of this force rose from thirty to forty thousand cavalry and ten thousand infantry. Shivājī built a considerable fleet, the crews for which were recruited from among the low-caste Hindus of the Bombay coast. Although the achievements of the Marātha navy under Shivājī were not very remarkable, yet in later times the Marātha fleet under the Angrias gave considerable trouble to the English, the Portuguese, and the Dutch. According to the *Sabhāsad Bakhar*, he maintained an elephant corps numbering about 1,260 and a camel corps numbering 3,000 or 1,500. We do not know definitely what was the strength of his artillery, but Orme writes that "he had previously purchased eighty pieces of cannon and lead sufficient for his matchlocks from the French Director at Surāt".

There was a regular gradation of officers both in the cavalry and the infantry. The cavalry had two branches—the *bargīs* or soldiers provided with pay and equipment by the State, and the *silāhdārs*, who equipped themselves at their own cost and supplied the pay and equipment of the soldiers whom they brought to the service of the State, but were paid a stipulated sum by the State to defray the expense of service in the field. In the cavalry, 25 troopers formed a unit; over twenty-five men was placed a *havaldār*, over five *havaldārs* one *jumlādār*, and over ten *jumlādārs* one *hāzārī*, who received 1,000 *huns* a year. Higher ranks over *hāzārīs* were *pānjhāzārīs* and the *sarnobat* or supreme commander of the cavalry. In the infantry, nine privates (*pāiks*) formed the lowest unit under a *nāik*. Over five *nāiks* there was one *havaldār*, over two or three *havaldārs* one *jumlādār*, and over ten *jumlādārs* one *hāzārī*. Instead of five *hāzārīs* as in the cavalry, there were seven *hāzārīs* in the infantry under the command of the *sarnobat* of the infantry. Although Shivājī in most cases led the army in person, it was formally under a *senāpati*, or commander-in-chief, who was a member of the council of ministers. Since forts played an important part in the history of the Marāthas, ample precaution was taken to maintain the garrisons there in an efficient condition. Every fort was under three officers of equal status, viz. the *havaldār*, the *sabnis*, and the *sarnobat*, who were to act together and thus to serve

as a check on one another. Further, to prevent treachery on the part of the fort-officers, Shivājī arranged "that in each garrison there should be a mixture of castes".

Though regular and generous in making payments and giving rewards to the soldiers, Shivājī did not forget to enforce strict discipline on them. He drew up a set of regulations for their conduct so that their morals might not be lowered. The more important of these regulations laid down: "No woman, female slave, or dancing girl, was to be allowed to accompany the army.[1] A soldier keeping any of these was to be beheaded. Cows were exempt from seizure, but bullocks might be taken for transport only. Brāhmaṇas were not to be molested, nor taken as hostages for ransom. No soldier should misconduct himself (during a campaign)." As regards spoils of war, Shivājī ordered that "whenever a place was plundered, the goods of poor people, *pulsiyah* (copper money), and vessels of brass and copper, should belong to the man who found them; but other articles, gold and silver, coined or uncoined, gems, valuable stuffs or jewels, were not to belong to the finder but were to be given up without the smallest deduction to the officers and to be by them paid over to Shivājī's government".

D. An Estimate of Shivājī

Both as a ruler and a man, Shivājī occupies a distinguished place in the history of India. A born leader of men, who could throw a spell over all who came in contact with him, he elevated himself, by dint of his unusual bravery and diplomacy, from the position of a *jāgīrdār* to that of a *Chhatrapati* and became an irresistible enemy of the mighty Mughul Empire, then at the zenith of its power. The most brilliant of his achievements was the welding together of the Marātha race, "scattered like atoms through many Deccani Kingdoms", into a mighty nation in "the teeth of opposition of four great powers like the Mughul empire, Bijāpur, Portuguese India, and the Abyssinians of Janjīra". He left an extensive kingdom at his death. "The territories and the treasures, however, which Shivājī acquired, were not so formidable to the Mughuls," writes Grant Duff, "as the example he had set, the system and habits he had introduced, and the spirit he had infused into a large proportion of the Marātha people." The Marātha nation that he built up defied the Mughul Empire during

[1] We may contrast with this the influence of the harem that accompanied the Mughul army.

and after Aurangzeb's reign, and remained the dominant power in India during the eighteenth century, so that a descendant of Aurangzeb became the virtual puppet of a Marātha chief, Mahādājī Sindhia. The Marātha power also competed with the English for supremacy in India till it was finally crushed in the time of Lord Hastings.

It would be unjust to describe Shivājī as "an entrepreneur of rapine or a Hindu edition of 'Alāuddīn or Tamarlene", as Khāfī Khān and even some modern writers have done. A great constructive genius, he possessed all the essential qualities needed for the national regeneration of a country. "His system was his own creation and, unlike Ranjit Singh, he took no foreign aid in his administration. His army was drilled and commanded by his own people and not by Frenchmen. What he built lasted long; his institutions were looked up to with admiration and emulation, even a century later in the palmy days of the Peshwās' rule." He was not a relentless conqueror indulging in unnecessary cruelty and plunder for the sake of plunder. His chivalrous conduct during his campaigns towards women and children, including those of the Muslims, has been eulogised even by Khāfī Khān, a hostile critic: "Shivājī had always striven to maintain the honour of the people in his territories . . . and was careful to maintain the honour of women and children of Muhammadans when they fell into his hands. His injunctions upon this point were very strict, and anyone who disobeyed them received punishment." Rawlinson rightly observes: "He was never deliberately or wantonly cruel. To respect women, mosques, and non-combatants, to stop promiscuous slaughter after a battle, to release and dismiss with honour captured officers and men—these are, surely, no light virtues." Shivājī's ideal was the restoration of an indigenous Empire in his country, and he pursued it with singleness of purpose. But he had no time to work it out in full.

In his private life, Shivājī remained immune from the prevalent vices of the time, and his moral virtues were exceptionally high. Sincerely religious from his early life, he did not forget the lofty ideals with which he had been inspired by his mother and his *guru* Rāmdās, in the midst of political or military duties. He sought to make religion a vital force in the uplifting of the Marātha nation and always extended his patronage to Hindu religion and learning. "Religion remained with him", remarks a modern Marāthi writer, "an ever-fresh fountain of right conduct and generosity; it did not obsess his mind or harden him into a bigot." Tolerant of other faiths, he deeply venerated Muslim saints and granted rent-free

lands to meet the expenses of illumination of Muslim shrines and mosques, and his conduct towards the Capuchin fathers (Christian monks) of Surāt, during its first sack by him, was respectful. Even his bitterest critic, Khāfī Khān, writes: "But he (Shivājī) made it a rule that whenever his followers went plundering, they should do no harm to the mosques, the Book of God, or the women of any one. Whenever a copy of the sacred Quran came into his hands he treated it with respect and gave it to some of his Mussalmān followers. When the women of any Hindu or Muhammadan were taken prisoners by his men, he watched over them until their relations came with a suitable ransom to buy their liberty."

E. Shambhūjī and his Successors

Shivājī was succeeded by his eldest son, Shambhūjī, who, though pleasure-loving, was brave. His chief adviser was a Brāhmaṇa from Northern India named Kavi-Kulash, whose morals were not above reproach. Under the new king the Marātha power weakened but did not become entirely inert. Shambhūjī himself realised the nature of the Mughul menace, and fought the mighty force which Aurangzeb had brought to the Deccan with courage and resolution till he was surprised and captured (11th February, 1689), at Sangameshwar, twenty-two miles from Ratnagiri, by an energetic Mughul officer named Muqarrab Khān. His minister, Kavi-Kulash, and twenty-five of his chief followers, were also captured with him. The two chief captives were brought to the imperial camp at Bahādurgarh and were publicly paraded After being tortured in various ways for more than three weeks, the captives were put to death on the 11th March, 1689. The imperialists quickly captured many of the Marātha forts, and even besieged the Marātha capital at Rāigarh. But Rājārām, younger brother of Shambhūjī, slipped out of the city, disguised as a mendicant, and after various adventures reached Jinjī in the Karnātak. The capital city had in the meanwhile capitulated, and Shambhūjī's family, including his infant son, Shāhū, had been captured by the Mughuls. Thus the Marātha power seemed to be completely overthrown.

But the spirit with which Shivājī had inspired his people could not die out so easily. The Marāthas recovered quickly and again began a war of national resistance to the Mughuls, which ultimately exhausted the resources of the latter. In Mahārāshtra the Marātha recovery was effected by leaders like Rāmchandra Pant, Shankaraji Malhar, and Parashurām Trimbak. Parashurām became *Pratinidhi*

or regent in 1701. In the eastern Carnatic affairs were ably managed by Pralhād Nirājī, the first *Pratinidhi*. The Marātha captains now fought and raided in different quarters on their own account. Aurangzeb was, in fact, confronted by "a people's war" and he "could not end it, because there was no Marātha government or state-army for him to attack and destroy". Two able and active Marātha generals, Santājī Ghorpade and Dhanājī Jādava, swept on from one area to another, caused great loss and confusion to the Mughuls, and carried their daring raids according to the Marātha chronicles, even to the Emperor's camp. Many officers of the Mughul Deccan purchased safety by paying *chauth* to the Marāthas, and some of them even joined the enemy in plundering the Emperor's people. As Sir J. N. Sarkar observes, "the Mughul administration had really dissolved, and only the presence of the Emperor with all his troops in the country held it together, but it was now a delusive phantom. Santā and Dhanā were the heroes of this period; the initiative lay entirely with them, and they upset every plan and calculation formed by the imperialists".

Jinjī, having stood a siege of about eight years, was captured by Zu'lfiqār Khān in January, 1698. But Rājārām had escaped to Sātārā, where he gathered a powerful army and resumed the struggle in the northern Deccan, where Aurangzeb had assembled his forces. The imperialists besieged the fort of Sātārā in December, 1699, but the garrison defended it heroically till, after the death of Rājārām on the 12th March, 1700, it was surrendered on certain terms by his minister, Parashurām. The Emperor now seized fort after fort of the Marāthas in person, but what they lost one day was regained by them the next day and the war was protracted interminably.

After the death of Rājārām, his widow, Tārā Bāī, a lady of masterly spirit, guided the destiny of the Marātha nation at this juncture as regent for her minor son, Shivājī III. She was, as even the hostile critic Khāfī Khān admitted, "a clever, intelligent woman, and had obtained reputation during her husband's lifetime for her knowledge of civil and military matters". Having organised the administration of the State and suppressed the quarrels of the rival parties[1] for succession to the throne, she, as Khāfī Khān tells us, "took vigorous measures for ravaging the imperial territory and sent armies to plunder the six subahs

[1] The party of Tārā Bāī and her son; that of Rajas Bāī, another wife of Rājārām and mother of Shambhūjī II; and that which supported the cause of Shāhū, son of Shambhūjī I.


INDIA
Decline of the Mughul Empire
Kilometres
0 200 400 600 800
TIBET
PAMIRS
Balkh
Kaoshan
Dorah P.
HINDU KUSH MTS.
Kabul
R. Kunar
Khyber P.
Peshawar
Ghazni
Kandahar
Argandab R.
R. Gomal
R. Zhob
SULEIMAN MTS.
Bolan Pass
Multan
R. Indus
AFGHANISTAN
BALUCHISTAN
SIND
Tatta
KASHMIR
Srinagar
Chilianwala
Gujrat
R. Jhelam
R. Ravi
PUNJAB
Lahore
Amritsar
Sobraon
Ludhiana
Mudki
Sirhind
Patiala
Karnal
R. Sutlej
BAHAWALPUR
Firozpur
Panipat
Delhi
Agra
ROHILLAS
R. Jumna
R. Ganges
Bikanir
RAJPUTANA
Jaipur
Ajmer
Jodhpur
R. Luni
ARAVALLI HILLS
JATS
Gwalior
Jhansi
SINDHIA
Kalpi
R. Qumti
OUDH
Kora
R. Gogra
Sagauli
Khatmandu
NEPAL
R. Brahmaputra
BIHAR
Patna
ASSAM
Udaipur
Chambal
MALWA
Bironj
Mahidpur
Bhopal
Allahabad
Benares
Buxar
Monghyr
Ganges
Murshidabad
Dacca
R. Son
R. Damodar
Plassey
Hughli
Chinsura
Chandernagore (Fr.)
Calcutta (Br.)
BENGAL
Chittagong
CUTCH
GUJARAT
GAIKWAR
Baroda
Cambay
R. Narbada
Surat (Br.)
R. Tapti
Diu (Port.)
Sitabaldi
Nagpur
R. Mahanadi
ORISSA
Cuttack
BHONSLE
Arjungaon
Daulatabad
Aurangabad
Godavari
Bassein
Salsette
Bombay (Br.)
Kirkee
Poona
Koregaon
R. Bhima
Satara
DECCAN
Haidarabad
NIZAM
Vizagapatam (Br.)
Rajahmandri
NORTHERN CIRCARS
Masulipatam
R. Krishna
Goa (Port.)
R. Tungabhadra
R. Pennar N.
Bednor
MYSORE
Ampur
Vellore
Arcot
Madras (Br.)
Wandiwash
Pondicherry (Fr.)
Fort St. David (Br.)
Seringapatam
Calicut
Trichinopoly
Negapatam (Dutch)
Tanjore
Cochin (Dutch)
COCHIN
TRAVANCORE
Madura
CEYLON
Kandy
Colombo (Dutch)
Mughul Empire
Maratha States
Persian Frontier 1738-1747
Afghans 1748

of the Deccan as far as Sironj, Mandasor and the subahs of Mālwa". The Marāthas had already invaded Mālwa in 1699. In 1703 a party of them entered Berar (a Mughul province for a century). In 1706 they raided Gujarāt and sacked Barodā, and in April or May, 1706, a large Marātha army threatened the Emperor's camp at Ahmadnagar, whence they were repulsed after a long and severe contest. Thus by this time the Marāthas, with their resources enormously increased through raids, practically became masters of the situation in the Deccan and also in certain parts of Central India. As an eye-witness, Bhīmsen, wrote: "The Marāthas became completely dominant over the whole kingdom and closed the roads. By means of robbery they escaped from poverty and rose to great wealth." Their military tactics also underwent a change, the immediate effect of which was good for them. As Manucci noted in 1704: "These (Marātha) leaders and their troops move in these days with much confidence, because they have cowed the Mughul commanders and inspired them with fear. At the present time they possess artillery, musketry, bows and arrows, with elephants and camels for all their baggage and tents. . . . In short, they are equipped and move about just like the armies of the Mughuls. . . . Only a few years ago they did not march in this fashion. In those days their arms were only lances and long swords two inches wide. Armed thus, they used to prowl about on the frontiers, picking up here and there what they could; then they made off home again. But at the present time they move like conquerors, showing no fear of any Mughul troops." Thus all the attempts of Aurangzeb to crush the Marāthas proved quite futile. Marātha nationalism survived as a triumphant force which his feeble successors failed to resist.

CHAPTER V

DISINTEGRATION OF THE MUGHUL EMPIRE

1. The Later Mughul Emperors

THE death of Aurangzeb on the 3rd March, 1707, was the signal for the disintegration of the mighty Mughul Empire. Aurangzeb's apprehension that a civil war would break out among his sons after him, to prevent which, it is said, he left a will directing his three surviving sons, Mu'azzam, Muhammad 'A'zam and Muhammad Kām Bakhsh, to partition the Empire peacefully, was justified. No sooner had he breathed his last than his three sons entered into bitter fratricidal quarrels for the possession of the throne of Delhi. Of the three brothers, Mu'azzam was then governor of Kābul, 'A'zam of Gujarāt, and the youngest, Muhammad Kām Bakhsh, of Bijāpur. Kām Bakhsh, though he assumed "all the attributes of sovereignty", could not leave the Deccan. But the eldest, Mu'azzam, hurried towards Āgra from Kābul; and 'A'zam also marched towards the same city. Mu'azzam proposed to 'A'zam a partition of the Empire on the lines laid down by their deceased father, but the latter did not accept these suggestions and resolved to fight for his right to the throne. Nothing but the sword could now decide the issue, and the two brothers soon resorted to it. They met at Jājau, a few miles from Āgra, in June 1707, and 'A'zam lost the day as well as his life. After a brief expedition to Rājputāna, Mu'azzam marched to the Deccan, and Kām Bakhsh, being defeated near Hyderābād, died of wounds early in 1708.

Mu'azzam ascended the throne under the title of Bahādur Shāh (also known as Shāh 'Ālam I). Though "a man of mild and equitable temper, learned, dignified and generous to a fault", he was too old to prevent the decline of the Empire. His death on the 27th February, 1712, was followed by a fresh war of succession among his four sons, Jahāndār Shāh, 'Azīm-us-Shān, Jahān Shāh and Rafī-us-Shān. The last three were killed in course of the war, and Jahāndār Shāh secured the throne with the help of Zu'lfiqār Khān, who became the chief minister of the State. Jahāndār was completely under the influence of a favourite lady

named Lāl Kumārī. "In the brief reign of Jahāndār", observes Khāfī Khān, "violence had full sway. It was a fine time for minstrels and singers and all the tribes of dancers and actors." He was not, however, destined to enjoy power for a long time, but was deposed and strangled in the fort of Delhi under the order of 'Azīm-us-Shān's son, Farrukhsiyar, who proclaimed himself Emperor in A.D. 1713. The king-maker, Zu'lfiqār Khān, was also executed.

Farrukhsiyar owed his elevation to the throne to the two Sayyid brothers, Husain 'Ālī, deputy governor of Patna, and 'Abdullah, governor of Allahābād, who henceforth began to exercise the real power in the State and placed one prince after another on the throne. 'Abdullah became the *Wazīr* and Husain 'Ālī the commander-in-chief of the army; but as the former was a soldier and had no previous experience of civil administration, the full burden of administration fell on the latter. Farrukhsiyar was "feeble, cowardly and contemptible" and "strong neither for evil nor for good", and his attempt to assert his own power made his reign "throughout an agitated and perplexing one, ending in another Imperial tragedy". Under the influence of some of his anti-Sayyid friends, chiefly Mīr Jumla, he acted ungratefully, from the beginning of his reign, towards his Sayyid ministers. Their resentment was so great that they deposed and blinded the Emperor and executed him in an ignominious manner. The treatment that Farrukhsiyar received from the Sayyids was in no way more harsh than what he had himself meted out to his possible rivals. His worthlessness, intrigues, and ingratitude made his removal almost necessary for his ministers. But for men of position like them "the way of doing what had become almost a necessity was unduly harsh, too utterly regardless of the personal dignity of the fallen monarch. Blinding a deposed king was the fixed usage; for that the Sayyids are not specially to blame. But the severity of the subsequent confinement was excessive, and the taking of the captive's life was an extremity entirely uncalled-for".

The king-makers, 'Abdullah and Husain 'Ālī, now raised to the throne two phantom kings, Rafī-ud-Darajāt and Rafī-ud-daulah, sons of Rafī-us-Shān. But within a few months the Sayyids, who determined to "rule through the Imperial puppets", thought that they had discovered another *roi fainéant* in a youth of eighteen, named Rohsan Akhtar, son of Jahān Shāh (the fourth son of Bahādur Shāh), who ascended the throne as Muhammad Shāh. The new Emperor did not prove to be a docile agent of the Sayyids, as they had expected, and found many supporters among

those who had become enemies of the ministers during the seven years of their power. The ablest of the new allies of the sovereign was the famous Nizām-ul-mulk of the Deccan. Husain 'Alī was removed by assassination while he was proceeding towards Mālwa to chastise the Nizām. 'Abdullah made an attempt to retain his power by placing on the throne a more convenient puppet, Muhammad Ibrāhīm, another son of Rafī-us-Shān, but he was defeated and imprisoned in 1720 and killed by poison in 1722. The new *wazīr*, Muhammad Amīn Khān, expired in 1721, and the Nizām-ul-mulk was called upon to accept that post in February, 1722. As he was essentially a man of action, the atmosphere of the imperial court did not suit his temperament. He soon left it for the Deccan, where he established a virtually independent kingdom, though the fiction of imperial supremacy was maintained till the last. The fall of the Sayyids, and the departure of the Nizām-ul-mulk for the Deccan, did not, however, serve to increase the power and prestige of Muhammad Shāh. As Ghulām Husain, the author of *Siyar*, writes: "Young and handsome, and fond of all kinds of pleasures, he addicted himself to an inactive life, which entirely enervated the energy of the Emperor". Though destiny granted him a long reign, yet "in utter unconcern he let the affairs drift in their own way, and the consequence was most fatal". Province after province—the Deccan, Oudh and Bengal—slipped out of imperial control; the Marāthas established their power far and wide; the Jāts became independent near Āgra; the Ruhelā Afghāns founded the State of Rohilkhand (Ruhelkhand) in the North Gangetic plain; the Sikhs became active in the Punjab; and the invasion of Nādir Shāh dealt a staggering blow to the Delhi Empire. Thus within about three decades of Aurangzeb's death, the vast Empire of the Mughuls ceased to exist as an all-India political unit and was split up into numerous independent or semi-independent states.

The next Emperor, Ahmad Shāh, son of Muhammad Shāh, was unable to cope successfully with the disintegrating forces that had grown so alarming on all sides. The Empire rapidly shrank in extent, being reduced only to a small district round Delhi. The Emperor was deposed and blinded in 1754 by the *wazīr* Ghāzī-ud-dīn Imād-ul-mulk, a grandson of the deceased Nizām-ul-mulk of the Deccan, who now imitated the Sayyid brothers in playing the king-maker. He placed on the throne 'Azīz-ud-dīn (son of Jahāndār Shāh), who had been so long in confinement, and who now adopted the same title as the great Aurangzeb, and called himself 'Ālamgīr II. But the new ruler

"found himself as much a prisoner upon the throne as he was formerly in his confinement". His attempt to free himself from the control of the all-powerful *wazīr* only resulted in his ruin, as he was put to death by the latter's orders. The malignant hostility of this ambitious and unscrupulous *wazīr* compelled Shāh 'Ālam II, the son and successor of 'Ālamgīr II, to move as a wanderer from place to place. Passing through many vicissitudes of fortune, this unlucky sovereign had to throw himself ultimately on the protection of the English and live as their pensioner till his death in A.D. 1806. Shāh 'Ālam II's son, Akbar II, lived in Delhi with the title of Emperor till 1837. The Imperial dynasty became extinct with Bahādur Shāh II, who was deported to Rangoon by the English on suspicion of assisting the Sepoy mutineers. He died there in A.D. 1862.

2. Changed Character of the Later Mughul Nobility, and Party Factions

The deterioration in the character of the nobility during the eighteenth century had a large share in hastening the decline of the Mughul Empire. The nobles of the time ceased to discharge the useful functions which some of them had done in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. To the great misfortune of the country, they became eager only for self-aggrandisement and personal ascendancy, to achieve which they plunged the land into bitter civil wars, disastrous conspiracies, and hopeless confusion and anarchy. "To the thoughtful student of Mughul history," remarks Sir Jadunath Sarkar, "nothing is more striking than the decline of the peerage. The heroes adorn the stage for one generation only and leave no worthy heirs sprung from their loins. 'Abdurrahim and Mahābat, 'Sa'dullah and Mīr Jumla, Ibrāhīm and Islām Khān Rūmī, who had made the history of India in the seventeenth century, were succeeded by no son, certainly by no grandson, even half as capable as themselves." This was partly due to the incapacity and lack of resolution on the part of the later rulers of the country, who had not the ability to select the right type of men for administration but were guided by the selfish advice of interested and depraved flatterers. Thus when the Emperor "was a sluggard or a fool, he ceased to be the master and guide of the nobility. They then naturally turned to win the controlling authority at court or in the provinces".

Broadly speaking, the nobles were ranged in two parties. Those who were children of the soil, or had been long domiciled in the

country, formed the Hindustānī or Indo-Moslem party. To this group belonged the Afghān nobles, the Sayyids of Bārha, and Khān-i-Daurān, whose ancestors came from Badakhshān. These Indian Muslims depended mostly on the help of their Hindu compatriots. The foreign nobles of diverse origin, opposed as a class to the members of the Hindustānī party, were indiscriminately called Mughuls, but they were subdivided into two groups according to the land of their origin. Those who came from Transoxiana and other parts of Central Asia, and were mostly of the Sunnī persuasion, formed the Turānī party. The most prominent members of this group were Muhammad Amīn Khān and his cousin, Chīn Qilīch Khān, better known as the Nizām-ul-mulk. The Irānī party was composed of those who hailed from the Persian territories and were Shiahs. The most important members of the Irānī party were Asad Khān and Zu'lfiqār Khān, the king-maker. These were mere factions and were not like the political parties of modern times. Their members had no common principle of action among themselves except that of self-interest and no firm party allegiance. The nature of the political struggles of the period can be well understood when we note that, during the reigns of Bahādur Shāh and Jahāndār Shāh, the Irānī party was in the ascendant under its leader Zu'lfiqār Khān. But from the beginning of Farrukhsiyar's reign the Hindustānī party maintained its authority in alliance with the Turānī group. Then the Turānians and the Irānians combined to oust the Hindustānīs from power.

3. Foreign Invasions

A. Invasion of Nādir Shāh

As a natural sequel to the notorious incapacity of the unworthy descendants of Bābur, Akbar and Aurangzeb, and the selfish activities of the nobility, the Mughul State grew corrupt and inefficient. It lost its prestige not only within India but also outside it. The country, famous for its riches, which excited the cupidity of external invaders from time immemorial, became exposed to the menace of a foreign invasion, as had been the case during the dismemberment of the Turko-Afghān Sultanate. This time the invader came not from Central Asia, but from Persia, which had already snatched away Qandahār from the Mughuls. The weak defence of the north-west frontier (the most vulnerable point in the Empire), since the time of Aurangzeb, offered a splendid opportunity to the Persians, when they had become free from

internal troubles by 1736, to make a daring push into the heart of Hindustān under the bold adventurer Nādir Shāh. The feeble attempts of Nāsir Khān and Zakariyā Khān, governors of Kābul and the Punjab respectively, to guard their provinces were of no avail, as their appeals to the Delhi court for help passed unheeded, owing to the machinations of the leaders of the rival parties who fought for power in the court. Their defenceless condition has been thus described by Ghulām Husain, one of the most important Indian writers of the mid-eighteenth century: "The roads and passes being neglected, everyone passed and repassed, unobserved; no intelligence was forwarded to court of what was happening; and neither Emperor nor Minister ever asked why no intelligence of that kind ever reached their ears."

Nādir Shāh, born of a humble family and originally a robber chief, was, however, schooled by hardships and privations, which gave him considerable valour and ability and a restless energy. He helped in the recovery of Persia from the hands of the Afghāns, who had wrested it from Shāh Husain Safavī in A.D. 1722, and entered the service of its restored ruler, Shāh Tahmāsp, son of the deposed king, Shāh Husain, in A.D. 1727. Through the incompetence of his master, Nādir became the *de facto* ruler of the State and eventually deposed him in 1732. On the death of Shāh Tahmāsp's infant son and successor, Nādir became the ruler of Persia in reality as well as in name.

Nādir commenced his march towards India in A.D. 1738. The alleged violation of promises by Muhammad Shāh, and the ill-treatment of his envoys by the Delhi court, served as the *casus belli* for his invasion. As the Mughuls had sadly neglected the defences of the north-west frontier, Nādir easily captured Ghaznī, Kābul and Lahore in A.D. 1739. The whole province of the Punjab was thrown into great confusion and disorder, while the pleasure-loving Emperor and the carpet-knights of his court, whose conduct during Nādir's invasion "forms a tale of disgraceful inefficiency amounting to imbecility", did nothing to oppose him. They could think of shaking off their lethargy only when the Persian army had arrived within a few miles of Delhi. The imperial troops then marched to check the advance of the Persians and encamped at Karnāl, twenty miles north of Pānīpat; but they were routed in February, A.D. 1739. The vanquished Emperor of Delhi, almost at the mercy of Nādir as his captive, hurried to sue for peace.

The victorious Nādir and the humiliated Emperor of Delhi together entered Delhi, where the former occupied Shāh Jahān's palace-

chambers by the *Diwān-i-Khās*. At first there was no disorder in the imperial city, but a rumour of Nādir's death, spread by some mischievous persons, gave rise to a tumult in which some Persian soldiers were slain. Nādir at first merely took steps to quell the disturbance, but the sight of his murdered soldiers infuriated him and, burning with feelings of revenge, he ordered a general massacre of the citizens of the doomed city of Delhi. A contemporary account tells us that the slaughter lasted from eight in the morning till three in the afternoon. "Within the doomed areas, the houses were looted, all the men killed without regard for age, and all the women dragged into slavery. The destroyers set fire to many houses, and several of their victims, both dead and wounded, Hindus and Muhammadans, were indiscriminately burnt together." The survivors, blockaded within the city, were reduced to extreme misery, for, besides plundering the market-places, Nādir caused the granaries to be sealed up, placed guards over them and sent detachments to plunder the villages. The Persian soldiers deliberately tortured the principal citizens for money, and three crores of rupees were realised by force from the helpless and starving inhabitants of the wretched city, which presented for eight weeks a dreadful scene of arson and carnage. At the earnest appeal of Muhammad Shāh, Nādir at last called off his soldiers, but peace was not restored till the invader left the city for his own country. Muhammad Shāh retained the throne, but he had to sustain irreparable losses. The ruthless conqueror carried away all his crown jewels, including the famous Koh-i-nūr diamond, the costly Peacock Throne of Shāh Jahān, and the celebrated illustrated Persian manuscript on Hindu music written under the command of the Emperor Muhammad Shāh. According to the estimate of Nādir's own secretary, he exacted at Delhi fifteen crores of rupees in cash, and a vast amount in jewels, apparel, furniture and other valuable articles from the imperial store-house. He also took away with him 300 elephants, 10,000 horses, and the same number of camels. Thus the Persian invasion entailed a heavy economic drain on the resources of the decadent Delhi Empire. The trans-Indus provinces (Sind, Kābul and the western parts of the Punjab) had to be surrendered to the Persians. Further, the Mughul Empire lost the little prestige that it had still retained, and its decline now became patent to the world. In short, Nādir's invasion left it "bleeding and prostrate". Internally exhausted, it could get no time for recuperation and revival, as the invasion of 1739 set a precedent for further invasions from outside and Ahmad Shāh Abdālī invaded India as the successor to Nādir's empire.

B. Invasions of Ahmad Shāh Abdālī

After the assassination of Nādir in 1747, one of his officers named Ahmad Shāh, an Afghān chief of the Abdālī clan, rose to power and succeeded in establishing himself as the independent ruler of Afghānistān. He styled himself *Durr-i-Durrān*, "the pearl of the age", and his clan was henceforth known as the Durrānī. Ahmad Shāh Abdālī, while accompanying Nādir to India, had seen with his own eyes "the weakness of the Empire, the imbecility of the Emperor, the inattentiveness of the ministers, the spirit of independence which had crept among the grandees". So after establishing his power at home he led several expeditions into India from A.D. 1748 till A.D. 1767.[1] These were something more than mere predatory raids. They indicated the revival of the Afghāns, outside and within India, making a fresh bid for supremacy on the ruins of the Mughul Empire. As a matter of fact, the Afghān bid for supremacy was an important factor in the history of India during a considerable part of the eighteenth century. Ahmad Shāh Abdālī must have entertained the desire of establishing political authority over at least a part of India, though there were other motives, as Elphinstone points out, which led him to undertake these expeditions. He sought to consolidate his authority at home by increasing his reputation through successful foreign adventures, and he also hoped to utilise the booty derived from his Indian campaigns in defraying the expenses of his army and in showering favours and rewards on the Afghān chiefs.

After having conquered Qandahār, Kābul, and Peshāwār, Ahmad Shāh Abdālī invaded India for the first time, in January 1748, with 12,000 veteran troops. But he was defeated at the battle of Mānpur by Ahmad Shāh, the Mughul heir-apparent, and Mīr Mannu, son of the deceased *wazīr* Qamār-ud-dīn, and was put to flight. Mīr Mannu was appointed governor of the Punjab. But before he could settle down, Ahmad Shāh Abdālī invaded the Punjab for the second time in A.D. 1750 and conquered it after defeating him. Unsupported by the Delhi court, the Punjab governor found all resistance futile and submitted to the invader.

The Abdālī invaded India for the third time in December, 1751, when he again defeated Mīr Mannu, conquered Kāshmīr, and forced the Mughul Emperor, Ahmad Shāh, to cede to him the country as far east as Sirhind. Thus the Mughul Empire was further

[1] Some English records refer to an invasion of the Punjab by Ahmad Shāh Abdālī in A.D. 1769. *Indian Historical Quarterly*, December 1934.

reduced in extent. Mīr Mannu was now left as the Abdālī's governor in Lahore. He promised to send to the victor the surplus revenue of the Punjab and not to transact important matters without final orders from him. But the Abdālī led another expedition in the time of Emperor 'Ālamgīr II (1754–1759). After the death of Mīr Mannu in November, 1753, and that of his infant son and successor in May, 1754, the province of the Punjab fell into disorder and anarchy due largely to the wilfulness and caprice of the regent-mother, Mughlānī Begam. In response to an appeal from her for help, Imād-ul-mulk, the all-powerful *wazīr* at Delhi, marched to the Punjab, which he himself coveted, in 1756, brought it under his authority, and appointed Mīr Mun'im, "the leading nobleman of Lahore", governor of the province. Enraged at this, Ahmad Shāh Abdālī invaded India for the fourth time in November, 1756, with greater determination, and arrived before Delhi on the 23rd January, 1757. The imperial city was "plundered and its unhappy people again subjected to pillage". Imād-ul-mulk surrendered and was pardoned by the invader, who obtained from the Mughul Emperor the formal cession of the Punjab, Kāshmīr, Sind and the Sirhind district. After plundering the Jāt country, south of Delhi, the Abdālī retired from India in April, 1757, with immense booty and many captives, leaving his son, Tīmūr Shāh, as his viceroy at Lahore with Jahān Khān, the able Afghān general, as the latter's *wazīr*.

The administration of Tīmūr Shāh for one year, from May, 1757 to April, 1758, was a period of utter lawlessness and disorder The Sikh community, infuriated by the maltreatment of one of its leaders, rose in rebellion on all sides. Ādīna Beg Khān, governor of the Jullundur Doāb, revolting against the Afghāns, called in the Marāthas to help him. A large army of the Marāthas under the command of Raghunāth Rāo invaded the Punjab in April, 1758, occupied Lahore and expelled the Afghāns. They retired from the Punjab leaving Ādīna Beg Khān as their governor there. But the occupation of Lahore by the Marāthas did not last for more than six months. To avenge their expulsion of Tīmūr Shāh, Ahmad Shāh Abdālī invaded India for the fifth time in October, 1759, and finally conquered the Punjab. A more severe collision of the Afghāns with the Marāthas was inevitable, because both had been, more or less, contending for political supremacy in Hindustān. This took place on the field of Pānīpat on the 14th January, A.D. 1761. Ahmad Shāh Abdālī departed from India towards the close of A.D. 1762. He ordered the Indian chiefs to recognise Shāh 'Ālam II as Emperor. Nājib-ud-daulah and

Munīr-ud-daulah agreed to pay to the Abdālī, on behalf of the Indian Government, an annual tribute of forty lacs.

The Sikhs, who had revived by this time, slew Khwāja Abid, the Durrānī governor of Lahore, and occupied the city. This brought back the Abdālī to Lahore in March, 1764. He had, however, to return to his own country, after a fortnight's stay at Lahore, owing to the outbreak of a civil war there and a mutiny among his troops. Ahmad Shāh Abdālī invaded India again in 1767. He could not succeed in effectively thwarting the Sikhs and had to retreat soon "with a consciousness of his ultimate failure", owing to some internal troubles, chiefly the mutiny of his troops clamouring for pay which they had not received regularly. No sooner had he turned back than the Sikhs reoccupied Lahore and the entire open country. Ahmad Shāh Abdālī "retained hold of Peshāwār and the country west of Attock, while he abandoned the Manjha districts and central Punjab including Lahore to the Sikhs; but the Sind-Sāgar and Jech Doāb in the western Punjab remained a debatable land which finally came into their possession in the days of his unworthy successors".

Though Ahmad Shāh Abdālī had to return hurriedly from India, his invasion affected the history of this country in several ways. Firstly, it accelerated the dismemberment of the tottering Mughul Empire. Secondly, it offered a serious check to the rapidly spreading Marātha imperialism. Thirdly, it indirectly helped the rise of the Sikh power. "His career in India," observes a modern writer, "is very intimately a part of the Sikh struggle for independence." Lastly, the menace of Afghān invasion kept the English East India Company in great anxiety, both during the lifetime of Ahmad Shāh Abdālī and for some time after his death.

4. Rise of New Muslim States

On the decline of the central authority at Delhi, the inevitable centrifugal tendency was manifest in different parts of the Empire, and the provincial viceroys made themselves independent of the titular Delhi Emperor for all practical purposes, merely pretending to own a theoretical allegiance to his nominal authority. The most important of them were the subahdārs of the Deccan, Oudh and Bengal.

A. The Deccan

The Deccan *subah* became independent under Mīr Qamār-ud-dīn Chīn Qilīch Khān, better known as the Nizām-ul-mulk. His

grandfather, Khwāja Abid Shaikh-ul-Islām of Bukhārā, migrated to India about the middle of the seventeenth century and entered the service of Aurangzeb. Ghāzī-ud-dīn Fīrūz Jang, father of the Nizām, also came to India during the reign of Aurangzeb and rose to fame by holding several posts in the Mughul imperial service. Mīr Qamār-ud-dīn himself was appointed to a small command in his thirteenth year but he was promoted quickly and given the title of Chīn Qilich Khān. At the time of Aurangzeb's death, Chīn Qilich Khān was at Bijāpur, and observed perfect neutrality during the war of succession among the sons of the Emperor. Bahādur Shāh removed him from the Deccan and made him governor of Oudh. He retired from public service for some time but entered it again towards the close of Bahādur Shāh's reign with the title of his father, Ghāzī-ud-din Fīrūz Jang. Farrukhsiyar appointed him governor of the Deccan (1713) and invested him with the titles of Khān Khānān and Nizām-ul-mulk Bahādur Fath Jang, as a reward for his having espoused his cause. From the very outset of his viceroyalty the Nīzām-ul-mulk tried to check the growing strength of the Marāthas in the Deccan. But owing to party cliques at the Delhi court, he had to lose his viceroyalty of the Deccan by the end of 1713, and it was then conferred on Sayyid Husain 'Ālī. The Nizām-ul-mulk was transferred to Murādābād and subsequently his removal to Bihār was also thought of. But before he took charge of the new province, Farrukhsiyar's regime came to a close, and he was transferred to the government of Mālwa. It was in Mālwa that the Nizām-ul-mulk was able to lay the foundation of his future greatness. His activities there roused the suspicions of the Sayyids, who, in disregard of a previous promise, again issued orders for his transfer. But instead of submitting to these orders, he prepared to defend his position by arms. He defeated and slew Dilwār 'Ālī Khān and 'Alim 'Ālī Khān; and Husain 'Ālī, while getting ready to march against him, was stabbed to death. After the fall of the Sayyids, he again made himself master of the Deccan towards the end of 1720. On the death of his cousin, the *wazīr* Amīn Khān, in 1721, the Nizām-ul-mulk was summoned to Delhi and was appointed to the office of *wazīr* in February, 1722. But he did not find himself happy in the vitiated atmosphere of the Delhi court, where the frivolous courtiers of Muhammad Shāh rejected his advice and poisoned the Emperor's mind against him. So he left for the Deccan without the Emperor's permission in the third week of December, A.D. 1723. His enemies led their credulous ruler to believe that he was in rebellion and induced the Emperor to send secret instructions to Mubāriz Khān,

governor of Hyderābād, to fight against him, promising him the viceroyalty of the Deccan in the event of his success. But the Nizām-ul-mulk not only defeated and slew Mubāriz Khān at Sakhar Kehda in Berar on the 11th October, 1724, but also indirectly compelled the wretched Emperor of Delhi to recognise him as the viceroy of the south and confer on him the title of Āsaf Jāh, which his descendant still bears. "From this time may be dated the Nizām-ul-mulk's virtual independence and the foundation of the present Hyderābād State." The Nizām-ul-mulk's efficient administration of the Deccan has been highly praised by Khāfī Khān. Ghulām Husain also observes: "It is an extensive tract (the Deccan *subah*) that he governed with an absolute authority for the space of seven and thirty years." He died at the grand old age of ninety-one on the 21st May, 1748, when the quarrels for succession to the Deccan government gave opportunities to the European trading companies to interfere vigorously in the politics of the *subah*.

B. Oudh

The *subah* of Oudh then comprised not only modern Oudh but also Benares to the east of it, a part of the territory to its west and some districts near Allahābād and Cawnpore. The founder of the kingdom of Oudh was Sa'ādat Khān, an immigrant from Khurāsān. Appointed governor of Oudh in 1724, he rapidly rose to power and fame, and was summoned to Delhi at the time of Nādir's invasion; but he committed suicide the same year. The next governor of Oudh was Sa'ādat Khān's nephew and son-in-law, Safdar Jang. Appointed *wazīr* of the Delhi empire in 1748, Safdar Jang played an important part in the contemporary history of India till some time before his death in 1754, in spite of the opposition of Āsaf Jāh Nizām-ul-mulk's son and grandson. He was succeeded in the government of Oudh by his son, Shujā-ud-daulah, who also became the *wazīr* of the empire and was one of the principal figures in the history of Northern India till he died in A.D. 1775.

C. The Bengal Subah

Murshid Qulī Jāfar Khān, first appointed *Diwan* of Bengal and also *Faujdār* of Murshidābād by Aurangzeb in 1700, became Bengal's permanent Deputy *Subahdār* in 1713 and its full *Subahdār* in 1717. He proved to be a strong and able ruler, though he occasionally adopted severe measures to collect revenues from the local zamindārs. He transferred the capital of Bengal from Dacca to Murshi-

dābād. Fully alive to the economic interests of his province, he made attempts to prevent the abuse of *dastaks* by the servants of the English East India Company and wanted to collect from them the same amount of duties on trade as the Indian merchants had to pay. After his death in A.D. 1727, his son-in-law, Shujā-ud-dīn Khān, succeeded him in the government of Bengal. It was during the regime of Shujā-ud-dīn that the Bihār *subah*, the eastern limit of which extended up to Teliāgarhī (near Sāhebganj on the E.I. Ry. Loop Line), was annexed to Bengal about A.D. 1733 and 'Ālīvardī was sent as its *nāib nāzim*. Shujā-ud-dīn died in 1739, after which his son, Sarfarāz Khān, became the Nawāb of Bengal. But the new Nawāb's regime was not destined to last long. 'Ālīvardī, his brother Hājī Ahmad, the *rāyrāyān* 'Ālamchānd and Jagat Seth Fateh Chānd, organised a conspiracy against him. 'Ālīvardī marched from Bihār, defeated and slew Sarfarāz at Giriā, near Rājmahal, on the 10th April, A.D. 1740, and occupied the *masnad* of Bengal. He secured imperial confirmation of his new authority through questionable means, and began to govern the province in an independent manner. Trained in the school of adversity, 'Ālīvardī had developed some good qualities, which helped him to become an able administrator. Ghulām Husain observes: "A prudent, keen and a valorous soldier, there are hardly any qualifications which he did not possess." His attitude towards the European traders was strict but impartial, and he exacted occasional contributions from them only under the pressure of extraordinary circumstances. But destiny allowed him no rest to enjoy peacefully the *masnad* that he had seized by force. The Marātha invasions of Bengal from year to year during the greater part of his regime were a source of keen anxiety, and the rebellions of his Afghān generals, in alliance with their compatriots of Dārbhangā in Bihār, proved to be a serious menace to his authority. Unable to repel the Marāthas, even by assassinating one of their generals, Bhāskhar Pandit, at Mankarāh near Cāssimbāzār, 'Ālīvardī concluded a treaty with them in May or June, A.D. 1751, whereby he agreed to pay them an annual tribute of twelve lacs of rupees as *chauth* and also ceded to them the revenues of a part of Orissa. This opened the way for ultimate Marātha supremacy over Orissa, which could not be done away with by the English till about A.D. 1803. 'Ālīvardī died in April, A.D. 1756, when the *masnad* of Bengal passed to his heir-designate and favourite grandson, Mīrzā Muhammad, better known as Nawāb Sirāj-ud-daulah, whose brief regime of about one year and two months forms a turning-point in the history of Bengal and also of India.

5. Political Revival of the Hindus

One prominent factor in the history of India during the eighteenth century was the revival of the Hindus. It was not, however, characterised by any spirit of an all-India national, religious or cultural renaissance, but by isolated attempts on the part of the different Hindu or semi-Hindu powers, such as the Rājputs, the Sikhs, the Jāts and the Marāthas, to establish their respective political supremacy on the ruins of the Mughul Empire.

A. The Rājputs

The principal Rājput states like Mewār (Udaipur), Mārwār (Jodhpur) and Amber (Jaipur), whose sympathy for the Empire had been alienated by Aurangzeb, tried to throw off their allegiance to it after the death of that Emperor. They were first brought to submission by Bahādur Shāh. But very soon, Ajit Singh of Jodhpur, Jay Singh II of Amber and Durgādās Rāthor departed from the Emperor's camp on the 30th April, 1708, and formed a league against him. In view of the Sikh rising in the north of Sirhind, Bahādur Shāh pacified the Rājputs by conciliatory measures. But during the disorder that followed his death, Ajit Singh invaded the imperial territories. Sayyid Husain 'Ālī was sent to subdue the Mārwār chief, but the court-politics of the time had become so vitiated that the Emperor and the anti-Sayyid clique secretly urged the Rājput ruler "to make away with Husain 'Ālī in any way he could, whereupon the whole of the Bakhshi's property and treasure would become his; and he would, in addition, receive other rewards". Ajit Singh, however, could not carry out these instructions. He came to terms with Husain 'Ālī without a single battle, and in 1714 concluded peace with the Emperor by agreeing to give him one of his daughters in marriage. The marriage was celebrated the next year.

Henceforth, the chiefs of Jodhpur and Jaipur played important parts in Delhi politics and "by opportune aloofness or adherence they had added to their possessions a large portion of the Empire". The Sayyids tried to attach them to their party and they were rewarded with some appointments besides holding their own dominions in full sovereignty. Ajit Singh remained governor of Ajmer and Gujarāt till 1721. During the reign of Muhammad Shāh, Jay Singh II of Jaipur was appointed governor of Surāt, and after the fall of the Sayyids, he received also the government of Āgra. "In this way the country from a point sixty miles south

of Delhi to the shores of the ocean at Surāt was in the hands of these two Rājās, very untrustworthy sentinels for the Mughuls on this exposed frontier." Ajit Singh secretly assisted the Marāthas in their activities in Western India, and was removed from the government of Gujarāt. He met with a tragic and mysterious death at the hands of his son, Bhakt Singh. The revival of the Rājputs was only temporary. Woeful days of internal disorder and foreign exploitation were in store for their land.

B. The Sikhs

Guru Govind was stabbed by an Afghān in 1708. After his assassination the Sikhs found a leader in Bāndā. Proceeding to the north, Bāndā organised a large number of Sikhs and captured Sirhind after killing its *faujdār*, Wazīr Khān, the murderer of Guru Govind's children. The country between the Sutlej and the Jumnā next fell under his control. He established the stronghold of Lohgarh (or Blood and Iron Fort) at Mukhlīspur, half-way between Nahan and Sadhaurā, where he "tried to assume something of regal state" and struck coins in his own name. The Emperor marched against him and besieged the fort of Lohgarh, whereupon he fled away with many of his followers into the hills north of Lahore. However, after the death of Bahādur Shāh, Bāndā came out of hiding, occupied the town of Sadhaurā, recovered the fort of Lohgarh and again plundered the province of Sirhind. But in 1715 he was besieged in the fortress of Gurudāspur. The Sikhs fought desperately "contending among themselves for martyrdom, and many of them were captured after a fierce resistance". Bāndā and his followers were sent to Delhi and were relentlessly treated. "A reward was given for every Sikh head." Taunted by a noble, Bāndā replied that he had been "a mere scourge in the hands of God for the chastisement of the wicked and that he was now receiving the meed of his own crimes against the Almighty". His own son was killed before his eyes; and he himself "was tormented to death under the feet of elephants". Thus "the fortunes of the Sikh nation sank to the lowest ebb in 1716".

But the military power of the Sikhs could not be completely destroyed. The tenets of Nānak and Govind had "taken deep root in the hearts of the people; the peasant and the mechanic nursed their faith in secret, and the more ardent clung to the hope of ample revenge and speedy victory". The Sikhs began to organise themselves gradually, and Kapur Singh, a resident of

Fyzullāpur, started an organisation which developed later into the celebrated *Dal Khālsā* or the theocracy of the Sikhs. The disorders and confusion in the Punjab, following the invasion of Nādir Shāh, were utilised by the Sikhs to augment their financial resources and increase their military strength. "The suppression of the Sikhs, difficult under all circumstances, became even more difficult now." They built a fort at Dalewāl on the Rāvī, and plundering the country around, carried their depredations to the vicinity of Lahore. The invasions of Ahmad Shāh Abdālī also helped the rise of the Sikh power to a great extent. Though they met with some reverses after 1752, they ultimately gained complete victory. Especially after the third battle of Pānīpat, they took advantage of the disturbed political condition of the country to organise and strengthen themselves sufficiently, and greatly harassed the Abdālī on his return march. They opposed the Abdālī in his subsequent invasions, and after his invasion in 1767 reoccupied the entire open country.

C. The Jāts

Towards the close of the reign of Aurangzeb, predatory bands of the Jāts under individual village headmen like Rājārām, Bhajja and Churāman carried out depredations round Delhi and Āgra and increased their power. But whatever they could achieve was lost when in 1721 Sawai Jay Singh II captured Churāman's stronghold of Thun and the latter committed suicide. "Up to the middle of the eighteenth century," writes Sir J. N. Sarkar, "there was as yet no Jāt State, no politically united Jāt nation, no Jāt king standing clearly above the other village headmen or even recognised as first among equals; but only a robber leader whose success had drawn to his banners many of his peers in social status as partners in his adventures and plunder." But the scattered units of the Jāts were subjected to the "grasp of a superior controlling force" by Badan Singh, the son of Churāman's brother, Bhāo Singh. In the face of great difficulties, Badan Singh established the authority of his house over almost the whole of the Āgra and Muttrā districts by "matchless cunning, tireless patience, and wise versatility in the choice of means", and also by marriage alliances with some powerful Jāt families. Badan Singh died on the 7th June, 1756. His adopted son and successor, Sūraj Mal, who has been described by a contemporary historian as "the Plato of the Jāt tribe" and by a modern writer as the "Jāt Ulysses", because of his "political sagacity, steady intellect and clear vision", extended the authority

of the Bharatpur kingdom over the districts of Āgra, Dholpur Mainpurī, Hāthrās, 'Ālīgarh, Etāwah, Meerut, Rohtak, Farrukhnagar, Mewāt, Rewārī, Gurgāon and Muttrā. Sūrajmal, the greatest warrior and the ablest statesman that the Jāts have produced, died on the 25th December, 1763. "The reputation of the Jāt race reached its highest point under him and after him it was sure to decline."

D. The Marāthas

The Marāthas were the most formidable of the Hindu powers who made a bid for supremacy on the dismemberment of the Mughul Empire. They could not, indeed, form any strong determination of founding an empire immediately after the death of Aurangzeb, but were absorbed for a few years in internal quarrels. 'A'zam Shāh released Shivājī II, better known as Shāhū, in 1707 at the suggestion of Zu'lfiqār Khān. Zu'lfiqār Khān pointed out that Shāhū's return to his kingdom would inevitably cause a division among the Marāthas, who would thus be disabled from plundering the imperial territories when the main army was absent from the Deccan. It happened as he had expected. The claims of Shāhū were strongly opposed by Tārā Bāī, and a protracted civil war consequently ensued. Shāhū ultimately came out victorious, mainly with the help and advice of a Chitpāvan Brāhmaṇa from the Konkān, named Bālājī Viswanāth.

Born of a poor family, Bālājī Viswanāth was appointed in 1708 a *carcoon* or revenue clerk by Dhanājī Jādav, the *senāpati* or commander-in-chief of Shāhū. After Dhanājī's death, he was associated with the former's son, Chandra Sena Jādav, and received from him the title of *Senā Karte*, organiser or "agent in charge of the army", in 1712. Thus he got opportunities to display his ability both as a civil administrator and a military organiser, before Shāhū, in recognition of the valuable services rendered by him, appointed him *Peshwā* or prime minister on the 16th November, 1713. In theory, the office of the *Pratinidhi* was higher than that of the Peshwā, but by virtue of superior talents and abilities, Bālājī Viswanāth and his illustrious son and successor, Bāji Rāo I, made the Peshwā the real head of the Marātha Empire, the *Chhatrapati* or the king being, in the course of a few years, relegated to the background.

The Marāthas did not fail to utilise the distractions of the tottering Empire to their advantage. Bālājī Viswanāth obtained important concessions in reality from Husain 'Alī when the latter came to the Deccan and in form only from the puppet Emperor of

Delhi. To win over the Marāthas to his party, Husain 'Alī concluded a treaty with them in 1714 on the following terms: (i) Shāhū was to get back all the territories that had once belonged to Shivājī but had been conquered by the Mughuls, and to these were to be added the provinces of Khāndesh, Gondwāna, Berar, and the districts in Hyderābād and the Karnātak, conquered by the Marāthas, (ii) the *chauth* and *sardeshmukhī* of the six *subahs* of the Deccan were assigned to Shāhū, who was required, in return, to maintain 15,000 horse for imperial service, to pay an annual tribute of ten lacs of rupees, and to preserve peace and order in the Deccan. The acknowledgment of the overlordship of the Emperor of Delhi by Shāhū meant a complete departure from the ideal of absolute independence cherished by Shivājī, and the concessions secured by the Marāthas did not in any way affect the suzerainty of Delhi. But it should be noted that these were of much practical value. The treaty of 1714 has been rightly regarded as "a landmark in Marātha history", as by it the Marāthas were recognised "as co-partners in the revenues of the Imperial provinces, and, as a corollary, in political power there".

To destroy the ascendancy of the anti-Sayyid party at the Delhi court, Sayyid Husain 'Alī marched to Delhi with his new allies, and after deposing Farrukhsiyar placed another puppet on the throne, who was constrained to confirm the treaty already concluded between Husain 'Alī and the Marāthas. The march of the Marāthas to Delhi in 1719 was a significant event in their history. "The prestige of their presence at the imperial capital, not as mercenaries, but as the allies and supporters of the king-makers, held out to them a promise that they might some day make and unmake Emperors. Indeed, it was the surest basis on which Bālājī Viswanāth could confidently build his policy of founding a Marātha Empire." The power of the Marāthas also increased in other ways. Through the revival of the *jāgīr* system in the troubled days of Rājārām, the Marātha adventurers had splendid opportunities to carve out independent principalities for themselves. In addition to this, the Marāthas secured the right of collecting *chauth* and *sardeshmukhī*, for which distinct areas were distributed by Bālājī Viswanāth among the chief Marātha officers, who also took part in the wars of contending Muslim nobles as paid partisans.

After Bālājī Viswanāth's death in 1720, his son, Bājī Rāo I a promising young man, was invested with the office of the Peshwa. The Peshwāship came to be hereditary in the family of Bālājī Viswanāth.

Bājī Rāo I was not merely an able soldier but also a wise statesman. He at once perceived that the Mughul Empire was nearing its end and that the situation could be well utilised to enhance the power of the Marāthas by securing the sympathy of the Hindu chiefs. Bold and imaginative, he definitely formulated the policy of Marātha imperialism, initiated by the first Peshwā, by launching a policy of expansion beyond the Narmadā with a view to striking at the centre of the imperial power. So he suggested to his master Shāhū: "Let us strike at the trunk of the withering tree. The branches will fall of themselves. Thus should the Marātha flag fly from the Kṛishṇā to the Indus." This policy of Bājī Rāo was not supported by many of his colleagues, who urged on him the advisability of consolidating the Marātha power in the south before undertaking northern conquests. But by eloquence and enthusiasm, he persuaded his master to sanction his plan of northern expansion.

To evoke the sympathy and secure the support of the Hindu chiefs, Bājī Rāo I preached the ideal of *Hindu-Pād-Pādshāhī* or a Hindu Empire. When he invaded Mālwa in December, 1723, the local Hindu zamindārs assisted him greatly although they had to make thereby enormous sacrifices in life and money. Taking advantage of a civil war in Gujarāt, the Marāthas established their hold in that rich province. But the intervention of Bājī Rāo I in its affairs was strongly resented by a rival Marātha party under the leadership of the hereditary *senāpati* or commander-in-chief Trimbak Rāo Dhābāde. Rājā Shambhūjī II of the Kolhāpur branch of Shivājī's family and the Nizām-ul-mulk, jealous of Bāji Rāo I's successes, joined Trimbak Rāo Dhābāde. But Bājī Rāo I, by force of his superior genius, frustrated the plans of his enemies. Trimbak Rāo Dhābāde was defeated and slain in a battle, fought on the 1st April, 1731, on the plains of Bilhāpur near Dhāboī between Barodā and that town. This victory of Bājī Rāo I "forms a landmark in the history of the Peshwās". It left him without any serious rival at home and "with all but nominal control of the Marātha sovereignty". With the Nizām-ul-mulk also he arrived at a compromise in August, 1731, by which the former "was to be at liberty to gratify his ambitions in the south, the Peshwā in the north".

Bājī Rāo I fortunately secured the friendship of Jay Singh II Sawai of Amber and Chhatrasāl Bundelā. In 1737 he marched on to the vicinity of Delhi but did not enter it in order to avoid hurting the Emperor's sentiments. To get rid of this Marātha menace, the Emperor summoned the Nizām-ul-mulk, the arch-enemy of Bājī Rāo I, to Delhi for help. The Nizām-ul-mulk had no scruple in

ignoring the compromise of 1731 and at once responded to the Emperor's call, which he considered to give a favourable opportunity of checking the rising power of Bājī Rāo I. The two rivals met near Bhopāl. The Nizām-ul-mulk was defeated and compelled to submit to terms by which he promised "to grant to Bājī Rāo the whole of Mālwa, and the complete sovereignty of the territory between the Narmadā and the Chambal; to obtain a confirmation of this cession from the Emperor; and to use every endeavour to procure the payment of fifty lakhs of rupees, to defray the Peshwā's expenses". These arrangements being sanctioned by the Emperor, Marātha supremacy, already established *de facto* in a part of Hindustān proper, became also *de jure*. On the west coast, the Marāthas captured Salsette and Bassein from the Portuguese in 1739. But soon Bājī Rāo I was somewhat perturbed by the news of Nādir Shāh's invasion. By sinking all his differences with his Muslim neighbours, the Peshwā made an attempt to present a united opposition to the Persian invader, but before anything could be done, he died a premature death in April, 1740, at the age of forty-two. Thus passed away one of the greatest Marātha statesmen, who, in spite of some blots in his private character, tried his utmost to serve the cause of the Marātha State. He may very well be regarded as the second founder of the Marātha Empire.

Though Bājī Rāo I enhanced the power and prestige of the Marāthas to a considerable degree, the State which he ruled in his master's name lacked compactness. Through the revival of the *jāgīr* system in Rājārām's time, some semi-independent Marātha principalities grew up within it. The natural consequence of this was the weakening of the Marātha central government and "its ultimate collapse". One of the earliest and most important of such principalities was Berar, then under Raghūjī Bhonsle, related to Shāhū by marriage. His family was older than that of the Peshwā, as it had become prominent during Rājārām's reign. The Dhābādes originally held Gujarāt, but after the fall of the hereditary *senāpati*, his former subordinates, the Gāikwārs, established their authority at Barodā. Ranojī Sindhia, founder of the Sindhia house of Gwālior, served creditably under Bājī Rāo I, and, after the annexation of Mālwa to the Marātha State, a part of the province fell to his share. Malhār Rāo Holkar of the Indore family also served with distinction under Bājī Rāo I and obtained a part of Mālwa. A small fief in Mālwa was granted to the Pawars, who made Dhār their headquarters.

Bājī Rāo I was succeeded as Peshwā by his eldest son, Bālājī II, commonly known as Nānā Sāheb and Bālājī Bājī Rāo, in spite of

the opposition of some Marātha chiefs. Bālājī was a youth of eighteen at the time, fond of ease and pleasure, and did not possess the superior talents of his father. But he was not devoid of ability, and, "after the manner of his father, engaged vigorously in the prosecution of hostilities, the organisation and equipment of a large army, and the preparation of all the munitions of war". He secured the services of some able and experienced officers of his father. Shāhū, on the eve of his death in 1749, left a deed giving the Peshwā supreme power in the State, with certain reservations. The Peshwā was to perpetuate the name of the Rājā and to preserve the dignity of the house of Shivājī through the grandson of Tārā Bāī and his descendants. He was also required to regard the Kolhāpur State as independent and recognise the existing rights of the *jāgīrdārs*, with whom he could enter into such arrangements "as might be beneficial for extending Hindu power; for protecting the temples of the gods; the cultivators of the soil, and whatever was sacred or useful". This arrangement was challenged by Tārā Bāī, who, acting in concert with Dāmājī Gāikwār, rose in arms against the Peshwā and threw the young Rājā into confinement. The Peshwā, however, defeated his opponents. The Rājā remained a virtual prisoner in the hands of his "Mayor of the Palace", the Peshwā, who became henceforth the real head of the Marātha confederacy.

Bālājī Bājī Rāo was determined to further the cause of Marātha imperialism; but he unwisely departed from the policy of his father in two respects. Firstly, the army underwent a revolutionary change in his time. The light infantry formed the chief source of strength in the days of Shivājī. Though Bājī Rāo I engaged a large number of cavalry, he did not give up the old tactics of fighting. But Bālājī admitted into the army many non-Marātha mercenaries of all descriptions with a view to introducing Western modes of warfare. The army thus lost its national character, and it did not become easy to maintain a number of alien elements under proper discipline and control. The old method of fighting was also partly abandoned. Secondly, Bālājī deliberately gave up his father's ideal of *Hindu-Pād-Pādshāhī*, which aimed at uniting all the Hindu chiefs under one flag. His followers resorted to the old plan of predatory warfare, and the ravages that they committed indiscriminately against the Muslims as well as the Hindus alienated the sympathies of the Rājputs and other Hindu chiefs. Thus Marātha imperialism ceased to stand for an India-wide nationalism, and it became no longer possible for it to organise the Hindu powers under one banner against the Muslim powers, internal or external.

These defects in Bālājī's policy did not, however, immediately check the expansion of the Marātha power both in the south and in the north. A large number of Marāthas appeared before Seringapatam in March, 1757, and forcibly levied tribute from most of the principalities south of the Kṛishṇā. The Nawāb of Arcot promised to pay "two lakhs in ready money, and two and a half lakhs in assignments" for the arrears of *chauth*. The Marāthas also invaded Bednore and the Hindu kingdom of Mysore and assisted the English under Clive and Watson in suppressing the sea-captain Angria. No doubt their progress was somewhat checked by Hyder, the rising general of Mysore, by Bussy the clever Frenchman, and by Nizām 'Alī of Hyderābād. But the Peshwā's cousin, Sadāsiv Rāo, inflicted a defeat on Nizām 'Alī at Udgīr in 1760. Ibrāhīm Khān Gardī, a brave Muslim artilleryman trained in Western methods of fighting under Bussy in the Nizām's army, joined the Marāthas. A treaty was concluded by the latter with Nizām 'Alī by which they got the whole province of Bijāpur, nearly the whole of Aurangābād and a portion of Bidar, together with some forts including the famous fortress of Daulatābād. These were valuable gains of the Marāthas at the cost of Mughul possessions in the Deccan, which thus came to be "confined to an insulated space".

More striking and significant was the expansion of the Marāthas in the north. At the end of the year 1756 Malhār Rāo Holkar, and, some weeks later, Raghunāth Rāo, were again sent to the north. Though Raghunāth Rāo was detained for about four months in Rājputāna, a force of 20,000 men sent by him under Sakhārām Bāpu cleverly secured the friendship of the Jāts and once more asserted Marātha supremacy in the Doāb. The Marāthas then entered into an alliance with the Delhi court against Nājib-ud-daulah, who had been left by the Abdālī as his "supreme agent" at Delhi and dictator over the Emperor. They attacked Delhi in August, A.D. 1757, and compelled Nājib-ud-daulah to surrender and make peace in September on terms dictated by them. Placing Delhi in the friendly hands of the *wazīr* Imād, Raghunāth Rāo and Malhār Rāo directed their efforts towards conquering the Punjab from the Abdālī's son, Tīmūr Shāh. They captured Sirhind in March and Lahore in April, 1758, and retired from the Punjab after appointing there the experienced local noble, Ādīna Beg Khān, as their viceroy, who promised to pay an annual tribute of seventy-five lakhs of rupees. They left, however, no adequate force for the defence of the newly acquired province. Thus Raghunāth Rāo's policy seemed to have "carried the Hindu paramountcy up to Attock". But "on a calm examination", remarks Sir J. N.

Sarkar, "Raghunāth's vaunted achievement is found to be politically a hollow show and financially barren". It secured not a pice for the Poona treasury but "saddled it with a debt of eighty lakhs to bankers, besides the arrears due to troops". Politically, it made another war with the Abdālī inevitable.

The Marātha domination over the Punjab could give no peace to the province. Ādīna Beg died on the 13th October, 1758, and the whole of the Punjab fell into anarchy and confusion affecting Marātha interests. To remove this, the Peshwā sent a strong force to that province under Dattājī Sindhia in 1759, and the latter placed Sābājī Sindhia as governor there. But the province was soon invaded by a strong Durrānī army, and by the end of November, 1759, the Punjab was finally lost to the Delhi Empire. Ahmad Shāh Abdālī then marched towards Delhi. He had this time the advantage of securing the co-operation of the Ruhelas, who had been harassed by the Marāthas, and that of the Nawāb of Oudh, who believed that the Marāthas were then the greatest enemies of the Muslim position in India. The Marāthas, on the other hand, could not act in combination with the Rājputs, who were alienated by the unsympathetic policy of Bālājī Bājī Rāo, and preferred to remain neutral; nor could they secure the alliance of the Sikhs, who had been rising in the Punjab. In fact, the short-sighted policy of Bālājī now reacted in depriving the Marāthas of the support of many of the principal indigenous powers at a very critical moment, when they were faced with a formidable opposition from the Durrānīs and their Indian allies.

The Abdālī defeated Dattājī Sindhia at Thānesar towards the end of December, 1759, and compelled him to fall back towards Delhi. The Marātha general was killed by the Afghāns at Barārī Ghāt, about ten miles north of Delhi, on the 9th January, 1760. "From the fatal field of Barārī Ghāt the Marātha army fled headlong towards the south-west, with the fresh Durrānī horsemen on their heels." The attempts of Jānkojī Sindhia and Malhār Rāo Holkar to oppose the march of the Abdālī also failed. Sadāshiv Rāo Bhāo, whose recent victory over the Nizām at Udgīr had immensely enhanced his reputation, was sent by the Peshwā with a large army to recover the lost predominance of the Marāthas in the north. By way of a brake on him, the Peshwā's son, Vishwās, a lad of seventeen, was sent as the nominal commander of this army. At the beginning the Bhāo's head was not "turned by insolence and pride"; rather he intended to increase his resources and strength by addition of arms and munitions and by securing the support of some North-Indian allies. He captured Delhi on

the 3rd August, 1760, but, unluckily for the Marāthas, Sūrajmal, "the shrewdest Hindu potentate then alive", abandoned their side owing to some differences of opinion with the Bhāo, who also antagonised Malhār Rāo Holkar. Further, "the coveted capital of India proved a Dead Sea apple" to the Bhāo, who got no adequate resources therefrom but whose difficulties were much aggravated by its occupation. About the middle of August he moved north from Delhi, and reached Pānīpat on the 29th October, 1760.

In the meanwhile, the Abdālī had captured 'Ālīgarh, compelled the Jāt Rājā to promise tribute, and had been able, through the support of his most helpful and constant Indian ally, Nājib-ud-daulah, to secure the alliance of Shujā-ud-daulah of Oudh, whose interests had been affected by Marātha ambition in the north and north-east. After undergoing some hardships and losses in the Doāb, the Abdālī arrived near Pānīpat on the 1st November, 1760. Thus the Afghāns and the Marāthas met on the historic field of Pānīpat, where decisive contests had been fought in former ages. The strength of the Afghān army was 60,000, half of which were the Abdālī's own subjects (23,000 horse and 7,000 foot) and the other half his Indian allies (7,000 horse and 23,000 foot). The Marātha army consisted of 45,000 soldiers in cavalry and infantry. Besides having superior horses, the Abdālī had artillery more efficient and mobile than that of the Marāthas, and his officers were clad in armour which the Marāthas hardly wore. In respect of their manner of campaigning, marching and discipline, the Afghān army was superior to the Marātha host. "The strict enforcement of order in camp and battlefield, the rigid punishment of the least disobedience in any subordinate, the control of every officer's movements according to the plan of the supreme chief, the proper gradation of officers forming an unbroken chain between the generalissimo and the common soldier, the regular transmission of his orders by an efficient staff organisation, and above all the fine control of the troops—which distinguished Ahmad Shāh's army—were unapproached by any other Asiatic force of that age. Above all there was the transcendent genius for war and diplomacy and the towering personality of the master—who had risen like Nādir from nothing and attained to almost the same pre-eminence of fortune and invincibility in war."

After a few minor skirmishes and battles near Pānīpat for about two months and a half, during which period the Marātha army suffered some losses and was reduced almost to starvation owing to lack of provisions, it marched to give battle in the morning of

From V. A. Smith, *"The Oxford History of India"* (Clarendon Press).

PLAN OF THIRD BATTLE OF PĀNĪPAT

A. Pānipat town and Marātha camp. B. The Durrānī camp. C. Ahmad Shāh's advanced tent. The numbers refer to the various divisions.

14th January, 1761. The Abdālī kept in the centre 18,000 of his own national troops in charge of his *wazīr*, Shāh Walī Khān, while two other corps of about 5,000 each, composed mostly of cavalry, were placed at his extreme right and left. Nājib and Shujā were placed on the left and the other Ruhelas on the right of his centre

The Marāthas were arranged by the Bhāo in three wings—the centre being under his personal command, the left one being composed of the regular sepoys of Ibrāhīm Khān Gārdī, and the right one of the contingents of Malhār Rāo Holkar and Jānkojī Sindhia. The Marāthas began the offensive with a cannonade, and fought with the valour of despair, gaining some initial successes. Ibrāhīm Khān Gārdī charged the right wing of the Durrānī army so furiously that about eight to nine thousand of the Ruhelas were wounded or slain. Sadāshiv Rāo Bhāo attacked the Durrānī centre under Shāh Walī Khān and pressed it so hard that he seemed to carry everything before him. But the Abdālī reinforced his centre and right at the psychological hour with about 13,000 fresh troops, which turned the scale decisively against the already exhausted Marāthas. The Bhāo, however, continued to fight with reckless valour against enormous odds, but to no avail. At a quarter past two in the afternoon Vishwās Rāo was shot dead. This made the Bhāo desperate and he made another attempt to retrieve the fortunes of his people. But this also failed at about a quarter to three and "in a twinkle of the eye, the Marātha army vanished from the field like camphor". Five Durrānī horsemen, greedy for the costly dress of the Bhāo, cut his head off. Thus fell Sadāshiv Rāo in defence of the honour of his nation, though it must be admitted that the failure of the Marāthas in the field of Pānīpat was largely due to his disregard for others' opinions and miscalculated plans. The supreme leaders of the defeated Marātha army had fallen on the field, and thousands of soldiers and other people of all descriptions, men, women and children, were massacred. "It was, in short," writes Sir J. N. Sarkar, "a nation-wide disaster like Flodden Field; there was not a home in Mahārāshtra that had not to mourn the loss of a member, and several houses their very heads. An entire generation of leaders was cut off at one stroke." The victors captured immense booty. The Marāthas lost 50,000 horses, 200,000 draught cattle, some thousands of camels, 500 elephants, besides cash and jewellery. The news of this awful disaster was conveyed to the Peshwā in a merchant's message: "Two pearls have been dissolved, twenty-two gold mohurs have been lost, and of the silver and copper the total cannot be cast up." The Peshwā, already suffering from a wasting disease, could not survive this national calamity. He died, broken-hearted, at Poona on the 23rd June, 1761.

The third battle of Pānīpat produced disastrous consequences for the Marāthas and seriously deflected the course of Marātha imperialism. Besides immense losses in men and money, the

moral effect of the defeat at Pānīpat was even greater. It revealed to the "Indian world that Marātha friendship was a very weak reed to lean upon in any real danger". The powerful Marātha confederacy henceforth lost its cohesion and the Peshwā's authority was terribly damaged. The Marāthas could never return to the position they had established before 1761. But it must not be thought that their power was irretrievably shattered by their discomfiture at Pānīpat. They quickly recovered some of their losses and made fresh attempts to re-establish their authority in Hindustān. The Abdālī could not stay in India as a permanent check on their revival, and he could not retain even the Punjab, where the Sikhs grew more and more troublesome. The next Peshwā, Mādhava Rāo I, a noble figure in Marātha history, "carried out the aims and objects of the Marātha policy as laid down by the first Peshwā" till he died in A.D. 1772. In considering the importance of the career of Mādhava Rāo I, Grant Duff observes that "the plains of Pānīpat were not more fatal to the Marātha Empire than the early end of this excellent prince". The Marāthas restored the exiled Mughul Emperor, Shāh 'Ālam II, to the capital of his forefathers in 1772; in 1789 Mahādājī Sindhia made himself a dictator at Delhi; and before being finally crushed, the Marāthas thrice opposed British attempts to establish dominion in India.

But none the less the third battle of Pānīpat "decided the fate of India". "The Marāthas and the Muhammadans weakened each other in that deadly conflict, facilitating the aims of the British for Indian supremacy." The rising British power got thereby the opportunity it needed so much to strengthen and consolidate its authority in India. "If Plassey had sown the seeds of British supremacy in India, Pānīpat afforded time for their maturing and striking roots." When the Marāthas again tried to check the supremacy of the English in India, the latter had been able to effect an immense improvement in their position.

CHAPTER VI

MUGHUL ADMINISTRATION

1. Nature of the Mughul Government

THE establishment of the Mughul administration, on ideas and principles different from those of the Sultāns of Delhi, was mainly the work of Akbar. Of his two predecessors, Bābur and Humāyūn, the former had neither time nor opportunity, and the latter neither inclination nor ability, to elaborate a system of civil government. While gifted with political genius of a high order, Akbar was indebted in certain respects to the Sūr example of administrative organisation. The Mughul government was a "combination of Indian and extra-Indian elements". It was, more correctly speaking, "the Perso-Arabic system in an Indian setting". It was also essentially military in nature and every officer of the Mughul State had to be enrolled in the army list. It was necessarily a centralised autarchy, and the king's power was unlimited. His word was law, and his will none could dispute. He was the supreme authority in the State, the head of the government, the commander of the State forces, the fountain of justice, and the chief legislator. He was the Khalifah of God, required to obey the scriptures and Islamic traditions, but in practice a strong king could act in defiance of sacred law if he so liked. There was nothing like a cabinet of ministers in the modern sense of the term. The ministers could not claim to be consulted as a matter of right; it was entirely a matter of the Emperor's pleasure to accept their advice or not. Much depended, indeed, on the personality of the Emperor and his ministers. A wise ruler like Shāh Jahān wanted invariably to consult a Sa'dullah Khān, while a minister like Husain 'Ālī Khān would have little regard, even open contempt, for his crowned puppets. The first six Mughul rulers of India possessed, however, a strong commonsense, and their autocracy did not, therefore, degenerate into an unbearable tyranny trampling on the rights and customs of the people. Endowed with the spirit of "benevolent despots", these rulers worked hard for the good of their subjects, in one way or another, especially

in the regions round the central capital and the seats of viceregal governments in the provinces. But the State in those days "did not undertake any socialistic work, nor interfered with the lives of the villagers so long as there was not violent crime or defiance of royal authority in the locality". From one point of view, the enormous power of the Mughul emperors was strictly limited. Their orders could not always be easily enforced in the distant corners of the Empire, not to speak of certain hilly parts of Chota Nāgpur and the Santāl Parganās, which most probably never acknowledged their sway. When we find almost each and every Emperor issuing orders for the abolition of the same kind of taxes and cesses in the very first year of his reign, we are led to conclude that previous attempts to abolish these had proved ineffectual and inoperative. There are copious references in the records of the English factories in India to show that even in the days of Shāh Jahān and Aurangzeb, not to speak of the reigns of their weak successors, the *subahdārs*, the provincial *diwāns*, and the customs-officers, occasionally acted contrary to the orders of the central government, mostly out of selfish motives.

2. The Nobility

Owing to several factors, the Mughul nobility was a heterogeneous body, composed of diverse elements like Turk, Tartar, Persian and Indian, Muslim and Hindu, and could not, therefore, organise itself as a powerful baronial class. Some Europeans also received titles of nobility. In theory, the nobility was not hereditary but purely official in character. A noble had only a life interest in his *jāgīr*, which escheated to the crown on his death; and the titles or emoluments could not usually be transmitted from father to son. The effect of the system of escheat was, as Sir J. N. Sarkar has observed, "most harmful". The nobles led extravagant lives and squandered away all their money in unproductive luxury during their life-time. It also "prevented India from having one of the strongest safeguards of public liberty and checks on royal autocracy, namely, an independent hereditary peerage, whose position and wealth did not depend on the king's favour in every generation, and who could, therefore, afford to be bold in their criticism of the royal caprice and their opposition to the royal tyranny".

3. Public Service and Bureaucracy

To maintain the military strength of the Empire, it was necessary for the Mughuls to employ a large number of foreign adventurers

Though Akbar inaugurated the policy of "India for Indians" and threw open official careers to the Hindus, yet the foreign elements predominated in the Mughul public service. The general character of the public services remained unaltered during the reigns of Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān. But deterioration in their efficiency began during the reign of the former, and became striking during the reign of his son and more so in the reign of Aurangzeb. Thus Prince Akbar wrote to Aurangzeb plainly in 1681: "The clerks and officers of state have taken to the practice of traders, and are buying posts with gold and selling them for shameful considerations. Every one who eats salt destroys the salt-cellar."

Every officer of the State held a *mansab* or official appointment of rank and profit, and, as such, was bound theoretically to supply a number of troops for the military service of the State. Thus the *mansabdārs* formed the official nobility of the country, and this system was the "army, the peerage, and the civil administration, all rolled into one". Akbar classified the office-holders into thirty-three grades, ranging from "commanders of 10" to "commanders of 10,000". Till the middle of Akbar's reign, the highest rank an ordinary officer could hold was that of a commander of 5,000; the more exalted grades between commanders of 7,000 and 10,000 were reserved for members of the royal family. But towards the end of his reign this restriction was relaxed, and, under his successors, the officers rose to much higher positions. The *mansabdārs* were directly recruited, promoted, suspended or dismissed by the Emperors. Each grade carried a definite rate of pay, out of which its holder was expected to maintain a quota of horses, elephants, beasts of burden and carts. But the *mansabdārs* rarely fulfilled this condition. Irvine writes that "in spite of musterings and brandings we may safely assume that very few *mansabdārs* kept up at full strength even the quota of horsemen for which they received pay". A *mansabdāri* dignity was not hereditary. The State Service was not specialised, and an officer might be entrusted at any moment with an entirely new duty. Akbar's wonderful capacity for "picking the right man for the right job" checked the evils of this system, but a deterioration set in later on with the change in the personality of the rulers.

The officers of the Mughul government received their salaries in two ways. Either they received them in cash from the State, or occasionally they were granted *jāgīrs* for a temporary period. They were not, however, given any ownership over the lands in their *jāgīrs*, but were only allowed to collect and enjoy the land revenue, equivalent to the amount of their salaries, from the

assigned tracts. "Any excess collected not only involved injustice towards the cultivators; it was a fraud against the State as well." *Jāgīrs* were frequently transferred from one *mansabdār* to another. The *jāgīr* system, however, gave some undue power and independence to the holders of *jāgīrs*; and Akbar, like Sher Shāh, was justified in trying to remunerate his officers by cash payments, and in converting *jāgīr* into *khalsā* lands, whenever possible. Whether paid in cash or in *jāgīrs*, the Mughul public servants enjoyed, as we know from the *Āīn-i-Akbarī*, inordinately high salaries,[1] which attracted most enterprising adventurers from Western and Central Asia. Various evils crept into the Mughul public services after the reign of Aurangzeb, if not earlier.

4. Departments of Government and Chief Officers

Though the Mughul Emperors had absolute powers, they appointed a number of officers in the different departments of the Government for the transaction of its multitudinous affairs. The chief departments of the State were: (*a*) the Imperial Household under the *Khān-i-Sāmān*, (*b*) the Exchequer under the *Diwān*, (*c*) the Military Pay and Accounts Office under the *Mīr Bakhshī*, (*d*) the Judiciary under the *Chief Qāzī*, (*e*) Religious Endowments and Charities under the Chief *Sadr* or *Sadr-us-Sudūr*, and (*f*) the Censorship of Public Morals under the *Muhtasib*. The *Diwān* or *Wazīr* was usually the highest officer in the State, being in sole charge of revenues and finance. The *Bakhshī* discharged a variety of functions. While he was the Paymaster-General of all the officers of the State, who "theoretically belonged to the military department", he was also responsible for the recruiting of the army, and for maintaining lists of *mansabdārs* and other high officials; and when preparing for a battle he presented a complete muster-roll of the army before the Emperor. The *Khān-i-Sāmān* or the Lord High Steward had charge of the whole imperial household "in reference to both great and small things". The *Muhtasibs* or Censors of Public Morals looked after the enforcement of the Prophet's commands and the laws of morality. The other officers, somewhat inferior in status to those mentioned above, were the *Mir Ātish* or *Dārogā-i-Topkhānā* (head of the artillery), the *Dārogā* of *Dāk chowkī* (head of the correspondence department),

[1] Making deductions for the monthly expenses of maintaining troops and other incidental expenses, Moreland calculates that a *mansabdār* of "5,000" received a net monthly salary of at least Rs. 18,000, one of "1,000" at least Rs. 5,000, and "a commander of 500" at least Rs. 1,000 a month. Moreland, *India at the Death of Akbar*, pp. 66 ff.

the *Dārogā* of the Mint, the *Mīr Māl* or the Lord Privy Seal, the *Mustaufī* or the Auditor-General, the *Nāzir-i-Buyutāt* or the Superintendent of the Imperial Workshop, the *Mushriff* or the Revenue Secretary, the *Mīr Bahri* or the Lord of the Admiralty, the *Mīr Barr* or the Superintendent of Forests, the *Wāqa-i-navis* or News-Reporters, the *Mīr Arz* or the officer in charge of petitions presented to the Emperor, the *Mīr Manzil* or the Quartermaster-General, and the *Mīr Tozak* or the Master of Ceremonies.

5. The Police

So far as the rural areas were concerned, the Mughuls introduced no new arrangements for the prevention and detection of crimes. These remained, as from time immemorial, under the headman of the village and his subordinate watchmen. This system, which afforded a fair degree of security in the local areas with only occasional disturbances in times of disorder, survived till the beginning of the nineteenth century. In the cities and towns, all police duties, including the task of maintaining public order and decency, were entrusted to the *Kotwāls*, whose duties, as enumerated in the *Āīn-i-Akbarī*, were multifarious: (i) to detect thieves, (ii) to regulate prices and check weights and measures, (iii) to keep watch at night and patrol the city, (iv) to keep up registers of houses, frequented roads, and of citizens, and watch the movements of strangers, (v) to employ spies from among the vagabonds, gather information about the affairs of the neighbouring villages, and the income and expenditure of the various classes of people, (vi) to prepare an inventory of, and take charge of, the property of deceased or missing persons who left no heirs, (vii) to prevent the slaughter of oxen, buffaloes horses or camels, and (viii) to prevent the burning of women against their will, and circumcision below the age of twelve. Sir J. N. Sarkar believes that this long list of the *Kotwāl's* duties in the *Āīn* represents "only the ideal for the *Kotwāl*" and not "the actual state of things". But Manucci also gives from personal observation an exhaustive account of the *Kotwāl's* duties. It is, however, certain that the *Kotwāl's* main business was to preserve peace and public security in the urban areas. In the districts or *sarkārs*, law and order were maintained usually by officers like the *Faujdārs*. "The *faujdār*, as his name suggests, was only the commander of a military force stationed in the country. He had to put down smaller rebellions, disperse or arrest robber gangs, take cognizance of all violent crimes, and

make demonstrations of force to overawe opposition to the revenue authorities, or the criminal judge, or the censor." The police arrangements were in some respects effective, though "the state of public security varied greatly from place to place and from time to time".

6. Law and Justice

Nothing like modern legislation, or a written code of laws, existed in the Mughul period. The only notable exceptions to this were the twelve ordinances of Jahāngīr and the *Fatāwa-i-'Ālamgīrī*, a digest of Muslim law prepared under Aurangzeb's supervision. The judges chiefly followed the Quranic injunctions or precepts, the *Fatāwas* or previous interpretations of the Holy Law by eminent jurists, and the *qanuns* or ordinances of the Emperors. They did not ordinarily disregard customary laws and sometimes followed principles of equity. Above all, the Emperor's interpretations prevailed, provided they did not run counter to the sacred laws.

The Mughul Emperors regarded speedy administration of justice as one of their important duties, and their officers did not enjoy any special protection in this respect under anything like Administrative Law. "If I were guilty of an unjust act," said Akbar, "I would rise in judgment against myself." Peruschi writes on the authority of Monserrate that "as to the administration of justice he is most zealous and watchful". The love of justice of the other Emperors, like Jahāngīr, Shāh Jahān and Aurangzeb, has been testified to by some contemporary European travellers. Though approach to the Emperor through all kinds of official obstructions was not very easy, at least two Mughul Emperors, Akbar and Jahāngīr, granted to their subjects the right of direct petitioning (which was only won in England after a hard fight). The latter allowed a chain with bells to be hung outside his palace to enable petitioners to bring their grievances to the notice of the Emperor.

The *Qāzī-ul-Qazāt* or the Chief *Qāzī* was the principal judicial officer in the realm. He appointed *Qāzīs* in every provincial capital. The *Qāzīs* made investigations into, and tried, civil as well as criminal cases of both the Hindus and the Muslims; the *Muftis* expounded Muslim Law; and the *Mīr Adls* drew up and pronounced judgments. The *Qāzīs* were expected to be "just, honest impartial, to hold trials in the presence of the parties and at the court-house and the seat of government, not to accept presents from the people where they served, nor to attend entertainments given by anybody and everybody, and they were asked to know poverty to be their glory". But in practice they abused their authority and, as Sir

J. N. Sarkar observes, "the *Qāzī's* department became a byword and reproach in Mughul times". There were no primary courts below those of the *Qāzīs*, and the villagers and the inhabitants of smaller towns, having no *Qāzīs* over them, settled their differences locally "by appeal to the caste courts or *panchāyets*, the arbitration of an impartial umpire (*sālis*), or by a resort to force". The *Sadr-us-sudūr* or the chief *Sadr* exercised supervision over the lands granted by the Emperors or princes to pious men, scholars and monks, and tried cases relating to these. Below him there was a local *sadr* in every province.

Above the urban and provincial courts was the Emperor himself, who, as the "Khalif of the Age", was the fountain of justice and the final court of appeal. Sometimes he acted as a court of first instance too. Fines could be imposed and severe punishments, like amputation, mutilation and whipping, could be inflicted by the courts without any reference to the Emperor, but his consent was necessary in inflicting capital punishment. There was no regular jail system, but the prisoners were confined in forts.

7. The Revenue System

The revenues of the Mughul Empire may be grouped under two heads—central or imperial and local or provincial. The local revenue, which was apparently collected and spent without reference to the finance authorities of the central government, was derived from various minor duties and taxes levied on "production and consumption, on trades and occupations, on various incidents of social life, and most of all on transport". The major sources of central revenue were land revenue, customs, mint, inheritance, plunder and indemnities, presents, monopolies and the poll-tax. Of these, land revenue formed, as in old days, the most important source of the State income.

The important revenue experiments of the Sūrs were undone in the period of confusion and disorders following the reigns of Sher Shāh and Islām Shāh. But the old machinery of government and the time-honoured customs and procedures must have been inherited by Akbar, who found at his accession three kinds of land in the country—the *Khalsā* or crown-lands, the *Jāgīr* lands, enjoyed by some nobles who collected the local revenues, out of which they sent a portion to the central exchequer and kept the rest for themselves, and the *Sayūrghāl* lands, granted on free tenure. After securing his freedom from the influence of Bairam and that of the ladies of the harem, Akbar realised the importance

of reorganising the finances of his growing empire, which were in a hopelessly confused state. Thus in 1570–1571, Muzaffar Khān Turbatī, assisted by Rājā Todar Mall, prepared a revised assessment of the land revenue, "based on estimates framed by the local *Qānūngoes* and checked by ten superior *Qānūngoes* at headquarters". After Gujarāt had been conquered, Todar Mall effected there a regular survey of the land, and the assessment was made "with reference to the area and quality of the land". In 1575–1576 Akbar made a new and disastrous experiment by abolishing the old revenue areas and dividing the whole of the Empire, with the exception of the provinces of Gujarāt, Bengal and Bihār, into a large number of units, each yielding one *kror* (crore) a year, and placed over each of them an officer called the *Krori*, whose duties were to collect revenues and encourage cultivation. But the *Krorīs* soon grew corrupt and their tyranny reduced the peasants to great misery. Their offices were, therefore, abolished and the old revenue divisions were restored, though the title of *Krori* continued to survive at least till the reign of Shāh Jahān.

Important revenue reforms were introduced in 1582, when Todar Mall was appointed the *Diwān-i-Ashraf*. Hitherto assessments were fixed annually on the basis of production and statistics of current prices, and the demands of the State thus varied from year to year. Todar Mall established a standard or "regulation" system of revenue-collection, the chief features of which were (i) survey and measurement of land, (ii) classification of land, (iii) fixation of rates. Lands were carefully surveyed, and for measurement the old units, whose length fluctuated with the change of season, were replaced by the *Ilāhī Gaz* or yard, which was equal to about thirty-three inches, *tanab* or tent-rope, and *jarib* of bamboos joined by iron rings, which assured a constant measure. Land was classified into four classes according to "the continuity or discontinuity of cultivation": (i) *Polaj* or land capable of being annually cultivated, (ii) *Parautī* or land kept fallow for some time to recover productive capacity, (iii) *Chachar* or land that had lain fallow for three or four years, and (iv) *Banjar* or land uncultivated for five years or longer. Only the area actually cultivated was assessed, and, in order to ascertain the average produce of land belonging to each class, the mean of the three grades into which it was divided was taken into consideration. The demand of the State was fixed at one-third of the actual produce, which the ryots could pay either in cash or in kind. The cash rates varied according to crops. This revenue system, as applied to Northern India, Gujarāt, and, with some modifications, to the

Deccan, was *rayatwāri*, that is, "the actual cultivators of the soil were the persons responsible for the annual payment of the fixed revenue". In the outlying portions of the Empire, this system was not applied, but each of these was dealt with as local circumstances required.

For purposes of administration and revenue collection, the Empire was divided into *subahs*, which again were subdivided into *sarkārs*, each of which in turn comprised a number of *paraganās*. Each *paraganā* was a union of several villages. The *amalguzār* or revenue-collector in charge of a district was assisted by a large subordinate staff. Apart from the village *Muqaddam* (headman) and the village *Patwārī*, who were servants of the village community and not of the State, there were measurers and *kārkuns*, who prepared the seasonal crop statistics; the *Qānūngo*, who kept records of the revenue payable by the villages; the *Bitikchī* or accountant; and the *Potdār* or district treasurer. These officers were instructed to collect revenue with due care and caution and "not to extend the hand of demand out of season". The Emperors were for ever "issuing orders to their officers to show leniency and consideration to the peasants in collecting the revenue, to give up all *abwābs* and to relieve local distress". There are instances in the reigns of Shāh Jāhān and Aurangzeb of extortionate revenue officials and even provincial governors being dismissed on complaints being made against them by the subjects to the Emperors. Though the lower revenue officers, especially those in the outlying provinces and districts, were not above corruption and malpractices, "the highest were, on the whole, just and statesmanlike" with few exceptions.

The success or failure of the revenue system thus organised must have depended on the quality and nature of the administration at the centre, and evils could not but appear when the administrative machinery was getting out of gear in Aurangzeb's reign. But on the whole its principles were sound and "the practical instructions to the officials all that could be desired". The ryots got a certain amount of security and the fluctuations of the State revenue were prevented, or at least minimised. Further, the ryots were not evicted from their holdings for default of payment, and the "custom of payment by the division of the crop", on the basis of the actual produce of a year, was better than the modern money rent system by which one has to pay the fixed amount irrespective of the harvest of the year. The demand at the rate of one-third, though rather high, as compared with one-sixth prescribed by Hindu law and custom or with what a modern landowner gets, was

not a heavy burden on the peasants, who were compensated by the State with the abolition or remission of various cesses and taxes.

8. The Provincial Government

In 1579–1580 Akbar divided his Empire into twelve provinces, the number of which rose to fifteen[1] towards the close of his reign, to seventeen in the reign of Jahāngīr and to twenty-one in the time of Aurangzeb. "The administrative agency in the provinces of the Mughul Empire was an exact miniature of the Central Government." The Governor (styled the *Sipāh Sālār*, Commander-in-Chief, or *Sāhib Subah*, Lord of the Province, or simply *Subahdār*, and officially described as the *Nāzim*) was the head of the civil as well as military administration of each *subah*. He had a staff of subordinate officers under him, like the *Diwān*, the *Bakhshī*, the *Faujdār*, the *Kotwāl*, the *Qāzī*, the *Sadr*, the *'Āmil*, the *Bitikchī*, the *Potdār* and the *Wāqa-i-navis*. The *Diwān* or revenue-chief of a province often acted as the rival of the *Subahdār*. Each was enjoined "to keep a strict watch over the other" so that none of them could grow over-powerful.

9. The Army

No large standing army was maintained by the State, but theoretically "all able-bodied citizens of the empire were potential soldiers of the imperial army". The history of the Mughul army is largely the history of the *Mansabdārī* system, the principal features of which have already been noted. Besides the *Mansabdārs*, there were the *Dākhilīs* or supplementary troopers placed under the command of *Mansabdārs* and paid by the State, and *Ahadīs* or a body of "gentleman troopers, a special class of horsemen, who were generally round the Emperor's person, and owed allegiance to no one else". The *Mansabdārī* system was not free from corruption. "False musters," writes Irvine, "were an evil from which the Mughul army suffered in its most palmy days. Nobles would lend to each other the men to make up their quota, or needy idlers from the bazars would be mounted on the first baggage pony that came to hand and counted in with the others as efficient soldiers". Steps were taken by Akbar's Government to remove these evil practices. Regulations were introduced for periodical musters, a *chihrāh* or descriptive roll of a *Mansabdār* was drawn

[1] Āgra, Allahābād, Oudh, Delhi, Lahore, Multān, Kābul, Ajmer, Bengal, Bihār, Ahmadābād, Mālwa, Berar, Khāndesh, Ahmadnagar.

up, "showing his name, his father's name, his tribe or caste, his place of origin, followed by details of his personal appearance"; and the system of branding horses, known as *Dāgh-o-mahalli* or simply *Dāgh*, was revived. But these measures could not effectively check the evils.

To express it in modern terms, the Mughul forces were composed of (i) cavalry, (ii) infantry, (iii) artillery and (iv) navy. The cavalry was the most important of all these branches. The infantry was largely composed of men drawn from ordinary townsmen and peasants; and "as a part of the fighting strength of the army it was insignificant". Guns, manufactured within the country and also imported from outside, were used in wars by Bābur, Humāyūn, and Akbar, but "the artillery was much more perfect and numerous in 'Ālamgīr's reign" than before. The artillery was wholly state-paid. There was nothing like any strong navy in the modern sense of the term, but Abul Fazl writes of an "Admiralty Department", the functions of which were (i) to build boats of all kinds for river transport, (ii) to fit out strong boats for transporting war-elephants (iii) to recruit expert seamen, (iv) to supervise the rivers, and (v) to impose, collect or remit river duties and tolls. A fleet of 768 armed vessels and boats was stationed at Dacca to protect the coast of Bengal against the Mugs and the Arākānese pirates. But the naval establishment of the Mughuls does not seem to have been very formidable.

The Mughul army, though not so inefficient as some writers would ask us to believe, was not, however, without certain defects. Firstly, it was not a national army, but was a mixture of diverse elements, each trying to follow its own peculiar methods and manœuvres. Thus, though its numerical strength increased as years went on, it grew cumbrous and hard to be controlled and managed. Secondly, the soldiers did not owe direct allegiance to the Emperor, but were more attached to their immediate recruiters and superiors, whose acute jealousies and bitter rivalries often destroyed the chances of success in campaigns. Lastly, the pomp and display of the Mughul army in camp, and on the march, were largely responsible for marring its efficiency. Akbar could at times depart from this practice. But generally the imperial army looked like "an unwieldy moving city" and was "encumbered with all the lavish paraphernalia of the imperial court, including a proportion of the harem and its attendants, mounted on elephants and camels, a travelling audience-hall, musicians' gallery, offices, workshops, and bazars. Elephants and camels carried the treasure; hundreds of bullock-carts bore the military stores; an

army of mules transported the imperial furniture and effects". Referring to the grand camp of the Emperor Aurangzeb at Ahmadnagar, Grant Duff comments that "it proved a serious encumbrance to the movements of his army, while the devouring expense of such establishments pressed hard on his finances, and soon crippled even the most necessary of his military and political arrangements". This sort of camp life naturally produced luxury and indiscipline in the army. The inevitable deterioration set in under Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān and manifested itself fully in the time of Aurangzeb. The army became incapable of "swift action or brilliant adventure". In this respect, the then light cavalry of Shivājī, maintained by him under strict discipline, was far better than the Mughul army.

CHAPTER VII

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE

THE real history of the people in Mughul India, that is, of their social life and economic condition, is of greater interest and importance for us to-day than mere catalogues of political events or military campaigns. The sources for studying it are indeed meagre, but valuable information can be gleaned from the accounts of contemporary European travellers and records of the European factories; and incidental references are available in contemporary historical works in Persian as well as vernacular literatures of the period.

1. Social Conditions

A. Structure of Society

Society looked like a feudal organisation with the king at its apex. Next in rank to the king were the official nobles, who enjoyed special honours and privileges, which never fell to the lot of the common people. This naturally produced a difference in their standard of living. The former rolled in wealth and comforts, while the condition of the latter was comparatively pitiable. With abundant resources at their disposal, the rich naturally indulged in luxury and intemperance, and the apprehension of escheat of the wealth and property of the nobles at death destroyed their incentive to thrift. Excessive addiction to wine and women was a very common vice among the aristocrats. We are told by Abul Fazl that the Emperor had a seraglio of 5,000 women, supervised by a separate staff of female officers. Francisco Pelsaert, the chief of the Dutch factory at Āgra in the time of Jahāngīr, observes that "the *mahals* of the rich were adorned internally with lascivious sensuality, wanton and reckless festivity, superfluous pomp, inflated pride, and ornamental daintiness", and he denounces their debauchery in strong terms. The food and dress of the wealthy were rich and costly. They lived in highly decorated palatial buildings and amused themselves with outdoor sports as well as indoor games.

It should be noted that the existence of an alien nobility did not usually cause any heavy drain of the country's wealth to foreign lands, as none of the class was allowed to carry it outside. The nobles originally possessed qualities which made them efficient servants of the State so long as it retained its vigour, but they began to lose their old usefulness, and grew more demoralised, with the closing years of the reign of Shāh Jahān. Further deterioration set in during the reign of Aurangzeb and in the eighteenth century. The rivalries and conspiracies of the selfish and debased nobility of the later period, besides casting a malign influence on social life, were largely responsible for the political disorders of the age.

Below the nobles, there was "a small and frugal" middle class, not given to "ostentatious expenditure" but living on a standard suited to their respective offices and professions. The merchants in general led simple and temperate lives. According to some European writers, the merchants of the western coast, having made much wealth out of their extensive commerce, lived in a comparatively rich style and indulged in luxuries. The condition of the lower orders was hard as compared with that of the two higher classes. They could have no sufficient clothing; and woollen garments and shoes were above their means. As their other demands were few, they did not suffer from want of ordinary food under normal conditions; but, in times of famine and scarcity, their miseries must have been very great. Francisco Pelsaert writes with the experience of seven years that there were in his time "three classes of people who are indeed nominally free but whose status differs very little from voluntary slavery—workmen, peons or servants and shopkeepers". Their work was not voluntary, wages were low, food and houses poor, and they were subject to the oppressions of the imperial officers. The shopkeepers, though sometimes rich and respected, generally kept their wealth hidden, or, as Pelsaert writes, "they will be victims of a trumped-up charge, and whatever they have will be confiscated in legal form, because informers swarm like flies round the governors and make no difference between friends and enemies, perjuring themselves when necessary in order to remain in favour". Towards the end of Shāh Jahān's reign, the peasants were more harassed by the provincial governors, their condition became worse, and the evil of pauperism increased.

B. Social habits and practices

The vice of intemperance was not so common among the ordinary people as among the rich. "None of the people there," remarks Terry, "are at any time seen drunk (though they might find liquor enough to do it) but the very offal and dregs of that people, and these rarely or very seldom." They were temperate in their diet, and were civil to strangers.

Both Hindus and Muslims believed in the maxims and predictions of astrology. Prominent social practices of the period were *satī*, child-marriage, *kulinism* and the dowry-system. Akbar tried to regulate social usages in such a way as to make the consent of both the bride and the bridegroom, and the permission of the parents, necessary for marriage contracts. He also sought to check marriage before puberty by either party, marriages between near relatives, acceptance of high dowries, and polygamy. But his attempts do not seem to have been effective in practice. Social evils increased during the eighteenth century, particularly in Bengal, and they have been frequently referred to in the works of contemporary European writers like Bolts, Craufurd and Scrafton, and also in contemporary literature. The Marātha society of the time did not, however, encourage acceptance of dowries. The Peshwās exercised an effective control over the social and religious affairs of Mahārāshtra, and their marriage regulations "evinced", remarks Dr. Sen, "a liberal spirit that may be profitably imitated by their modern descendants". They were opposed to forcible marriages, but informal marriages were occasionally permitted by them if the motives of the contracting parties were correct. Widow-remarriage was prevalent among the non-Brāhmaṇas of Mahārāshtra, as also among the Jāts of the Punjab and the Jumnā valley; and polyandry was not unknown among the latter. In the middle of the eighteenth century, Rājā Rājballabh of Dacca made an unsuccessful attempt to introduce widow-remarriage. Though the women were generally "subject to the will of their masters", instances of their taking an active part in political affairs are not rare.

C. Deterioration in the eighteenth century

In general, however, we notice a regrettable deterioration in social life during the eighteenth century, which forms, from many points of view, one of the darkest periods in the history of India. A modern writer has justly remarked that by the end of this century

and the beginning of the next "in social usage, in politics, in the realm of religion and art, we had entered the zone of uncreative habit, of decadent tradition, and ceased to exercise our humanity".

One redeeming feature in this period of all-round decline was the continuity of the process of Hindu-Muslim rapprochement and amicable contact between the members of the two communities, in spite of the bitter political rivalries of several centuries. Akbar's reign is remarkably important and instructive for the existence of Hindu-Muslim harmony. Illustrations of this are not lacking even in the reign of Aurangzeb. Alāwal, a Muhammadan poet, who translated in the seventeenth century the Hindī poem *Padmāvat* into Bengali, was the author of several poems on Vaishṇava subjects. 'Abdullah Khān, one of the Sayyid brothers, observed the *Basant* and *Holī* festivals, and Sirāj-ud-daulah and Mīr Jāfar enjoyed *Holī* festivals along with their friends and relatives. It is said that on his death-bed Mīr Jāfar drank a few drops of water poured in libation over the idol of Kirīteswarī near Murshidābād. Daulat Rāo Sindhia and his officers joined Muharram processions in green dress like Muhammadans. It has been noted by a modern Indian writer on the authority of *Jām-i-Jahān Numā*, a Persian weekly of the early nineteenth century, how the Durgā Pujā was celebrated at the Delhi court so late as A.D. 1825.

2. Economic Conditions

A. Economic condition in pre-Akbarid days

We have very meagre information about the economic condition of India during the reigns of the first two Tīmūrids. Most of the historians have questioned the accuracy of the description of Hindustān given by Bābur in his *Memoirs*. The *Humāyūn-nāmah* of Gulbadan Begam refers incidentally to the low prices prevailing in Hindustān; for example, at Amarkot, the birthplace of Akbar, the price of four goats was one rupee. The comprehensive economic reforms of Sher Shāh must have effected an improvement in the economic condition of the people in his kingdom, which was not very much disturbed at least so long as the Sūr administration retained its vigour.

B. Economic condition after the days of Akbar

So far as the economic condition of the country during the reigns of the great Mughuls, and those of the later Mughuls, is concerned, we get copious information from the *Āīn-i-Akbarī* and

some incidental references in some other works in Persian; from the accounts of contemporary European merchants, travellers and writers; from the records of the European factories in India; and also from contemporary Indian literature. We can only attempt here to give a brief survey of the important aspects of the economic condition of India during the centuries of Mughul rule.

C. Prosperous cities

Prosperity and plenty prevailed in the chief cities of India in the age of the great Mughuls. Writing in A.D. 1585, Fitch observed: "Āgra and Fatehpore are two very great cities, either of them much greater than London and very populous. Between Āgra and Fatehpore are twelve miles, and all the way is a market of victual and other things, as full as though a man were still in a town, and so many people as if a man were in a market." Terry refers to the Punjab as "a large province, and most fruitful. Lahore is the chief city thereof, built very large, and abounds both in people and riches, one of the principal cities for trade in all India". Monserrate asserted that in 1581 Lahore was "not second to any city in Europe or Asia". Burhānpur in Khāndesh was "very great, rich and full of people". Ahmadābād in Gujarāt has been described by Abul Fazl as "a noble city in a high state of prosperity", which "for the pleasantness of its climate and display of the choicest productions of the whole globe is almost unrivalled". In Eastern India there was much opulence in cities like Benares, Patna, Rājmahal, Burdwān, Huglī, Dacca and Chittāgong.

D. Communications

There was no want of communications, along roads and rivers, for the purposes of the vast mercantile traffic, though they compare unfavourably with those of the present day improved under scientific conditions. Of course, with the exception of certain highways, the roads were generally unmetalled but the "main routes of land travel were clearly defined, in some cases by avenues of trees, and more generally by walled enclosures, known as *sarāis*, in which travellers and merchants could pass the night in comparative security". The rivers, some of which were navigable throughout the year and some through a part of it, afforded excellent means for the carriage of heavy traffic. Of course, the security of the communications depended greatly on the efficiency of the administration of the country. But even in the

eighteenth century the facility of river communication has been referred to by such writers as Dow, Rennell and Stavorinus, who had intimate knowledge of the province. There was a tradition of road-building activity on the part of the State since the early days of Indian history, which the great Sūr rulers imitated and the Mughuls also followed. A bridge was built at Jaunpur by Munīm Khān early in Akbar's reign. Jahāngīr constructed water-works at Burhānpur, and, under Shāh Jahān, 'Ālī Mardān Khān repaired or built the Rāvī canal in 1639, which benefited the people to a great extent.

E. Agriculture

The agricultural crops of the time were much the same as those of to-day. It is wrong to say that there was no localisation of crops as in the present day, for sugar was cultivated in many parts of Bengal and Bihār and was carried to other parts of India; and indigo was cultivated in certain places of Northern India. Pelsaert definitely tells us of the large-scale production and manufacture of indigo in the Jumnā valley and Central India. To meet the demands of widespread manufactures of cotton and silk goods, both cotton and silk were cultivated extensively in certain parts of India. Tobacco, introduced either late in 1604 or early in 1605, began to be cultivated by the people thereafter. Agricultural implements were also very much the same as those of the present day, and such was the case with the agricultural system with the exception of the comparative absence of artificial irrigation. The tenants were often subjected to the oppression and exactions of local officials.

F. Famines

The sufferings of the peasants knew no bounds during the frequent outbreaks of famine, caused by the failure of seasonal rains, especially because the Mughul State then made no systematic and prolonged efforts to provide relief and effected no substantial remissions in revenue collection. The little that they did was insufficient to alleviate the acute miseries of the myriads of people who died of starvation and the pestilence that closely followed it. A terrible famine broke out in 1556–1557 in the neighbourhood of Āgra and Biyāna, and Badāūnī "with his own eyes witnessed the fact that men ate their own kind and the appearance of the famished sufferers was so hideous that one could scarcely look upon them. . . . The whole country was a desert, and no husbandman remained to till the ground". Gujarāt, one of the richest

provinces in India, was stricken with famine and pestilence in 1573–1574, so that "the inhabitants, rich and poor, fled from the country and were scattered abroad". The country was so greatly affected by the horrors of a severe famine lasting from 1594 to 1598 that "men ate their own kind. The streets and roads were blocked up with dead bodies and no assistance could be rendered for their removal". Akbar made an attempt to relieve the distress of the people by placing Shaikh Farid of Bukhārā, a naturally kind-hearted man, in charge of relief measures. But the miseries of the people, due to this catastrophic visitation, were too appalling to be removed by such steps. An equally horrible famine devastated the Deccan and Gujarāt in 1630–1632. The horrors of this calamity were so great that, as 'Abdul Hamīd Lāhorī, the official historian of the reign of Shāh Jahān, writes, "men began to devour each other, and the flesh of a son was preferred to his love". A Dutch merchant, who witnessed the calamity, notes that "men lying in the street, not yet dead, were cut up by others, and men fed on living men, so that even in the streets, and still more on road journeys, men ran great danger of being murdered or eaten". Shāh Jahān "opened a few soup-kitchens", distributed 1½ lacs of rupees in charity and remitted one-eleventh of the land-revenue assessment; but this could not suffice to mitigate the sufferings of the starving people. There were occasional outbreaks of famine during the succeeding years till the close of Aurangzeb's reign, but none was so severe in nature as that of 1630–1632.

G. Industry and Crafts

One of the most important factor in the economic history of India during the period under review was the extensive and varied industrial activity of the people, which besides supplying the needs of the local aristocracy and merchants could meet the demands of traders coming from Europe and other parts of Asia. By far the most important industry in India during this period was the manufacture of cotton cloth. The principal centres of cotton manufacture were distributed throughout the country, as, for example, at some places on the Coromandel coast, at Patan in Gujarāt, Burhānpur in Khāndesh, Jaunpur, Benares, Patna and some other places in the United Provinces and Bihār, and many cities and villages in Orissa and Bengal. The whole country from Orissa to East Bengal looked like a big cotton factory, and the Dacca district was specially reputed for its delicate muslin fabrics, "the best and finest cloth made of cotton" that was in all India. Pelsaert notes that at Chābāspur and

Sonārgāon in East Bengal "all live by the weaving industry and the produce has the highest reputation and quality". Bernier observes: "There is in *Bengale* such a quantity of cotton and silk, that the Kingdom may be called the common storehouse for those two kinds of merchandise, not of Hindoustan or the Empire of the *Great Mogul* only, but of all the neighbouring kingdoms, and even of Europe." The dyeing industry, too, was in a flourishing condition. Terry tells us that coarser cotton cloths were either dyed or printed with a "variety of well-shaped and well-coloured flowers or figures, which are so fixed in the cloth that no water can wash them out". Silk-weaving, limited in scope as compared with cotton manufacture, was also an important industry of a section of the people. Abul Fazl writes that it received a considerable impetus in the reign of Akbar due to the imperial patronage. Bengal was the premier centre of silk production and manufacture and supplied the demands of the Indian and European merchants from other parts of India, though silk-weaving was practised in Lahore, Āgra, Fathpur Sīkrī and Gujarāt. Moreland writes on the authority of Tavernier that, about the middle of the seventeenth century, the total production of silk in Bengal was "about 2½ million pounds out of which one million pounds were worked up locally, ¾ million were exported raw by the Dutch and ¾ million distributed over India, most of it going to Gujarāt, but some being taken by merchants from Central Asia". Shawl and carpet-weaving industries flourished under the patronage of Akbar; the former woven mainly from hair, having originated from Kāshmīr, was manufactured also at Lahore, and the latter at Lahore and Āgra. Woollen goods, chiefly coarse blankets, were also woven. Though India had lost her old vigorous maritime activity, the ship-building industry did not die out at this time, and we have references to it from contemporary literature. Saltpetre, used chiefly as an ingredient for gunpowder in India and also exported outside by the Dutch and English traders, was manufactured in widely distributed parts of India during the seventeenth century, particularly in Peninsular India, Coromandel coast and the Bihār section of the Indo-Gangetic region. Bihār henceforth enjoyed a special reputation for the manufacture of this article till the first half of the nineteenth century, and it was in high demand by the Europeans for use in wars in their countries. Besides these major industries, we have testimony regarding various crafts during the Mughul period. Edward Terry noticed that "many curious boxes, trunks, standishes (pen-cases), carpets, with other excellent manufactures, may be there had". Pelsaert also writes that in Sind "ornamental desks, draught-

boards, writing-cases, and similar goods are manufactured locally in large quantities; they are pretty, inlaid with ivory and ebony, and used to be exported in large quantities from Goa, and the coast towns". Though the State encouraged manufactures, the weavers were directly financed in most cases by middlemen, who must have exploited them greatly. Further, as both Bernier and Pelsaert tell us, they suffered from harsh treatment at the hands of the nobles and officers, who forced them to sell goods at low prices and exacted from them forbidden *abwābs*. This deprived the weavers and craftsmen of the benefit of economic profit from their occupations, though the taste of the nobles for high-class manufactures kept up the tradition of their quality.

H. Prices

We learn from Abul Fazl, and some other writers, that the prices of articles, especially those of common consumption like rice, vegetables, spices, meat, livestock and milk, were very low. Edward Terry observes that "the plenty of provisions was very great throughout the whole country; . . . and everyone there may eat bread without scarceness". Smith writes that "the hired landless labourer in the time of Akbar and Jahāngīr probably had more to eat than he has now", but Moreland is of opinion that "speaking generally the masses lived on the same economic plane as now". It is certain that there was no golden age of opulence for the common people under the Mughuls, because though the prices of articles were cheap, their average income was proportionately low or perhaps lower. They did not, however, grovel in misery and smart under discontent, as their needs were few and the problems of life were not so complicated as those of the present day.

I. Mints and Currency

Akbar, like Sher Shāh, tried to regulate the currency of the State. Towards the end of 1577 he appointed Khwāja 'Abdus Samād of Shīrāz master of the imperial mint at Delhi, and one important officer was placed over each of the chief provincial mints in Bengal, Lahore, Jaunpur, Ahmadābād and Patna. During the reign of Shāh Jahān, one of the most important mints was at Surāt. Akbar issued gold, silver and copper coins, the first having no less than twenty-six varieties of different weights and value. In Akbar's time, the silver rupee of about 175 grains was equivalent

in value to 2*s*. 3*d*. sterling. Akbar also issued a square silver rupee known as the *jalālī*. As in Sher Shāh's currency, the chief copper coin of Akbar's time was the *dām*, also called *paisā* or *fulūs*, which weighed 323·5 grains, formed the ready money for both the rich and the poor, and was divided into twenty-five parts, known as *jītals*, for purposes of account. Mercantile affairs of the Empire during the reigns of Akbar and his successors were transacted in round gold *mohurs*, rupees and *dāms*. The coins of the Mughul State, especially those of Akbar, "were excellent in respect of purity of metal, fullness of weight, and artistic execution". The rupee was equivalent in value to forty *dāms* up to 1616 and thirty *dāms*, or a little more or less, from 1627 onwards. But there was no great alteration in currency after Akbar, though in 1659 the English merchants wrote to the authorities in England that "the new king, Oran Zeeb (Aurangzeb), hath raised his coine (silver) to ⅝ per cent finer than formerly; which hath caused much trouble and contention between the merchants of Surat and Governor".

J. Foreign Trade

India had an active and considerable foreign trade, during the greater part of the Mughul period, with different countries of Asia and Europe. The chief imports of the country were bullion, raw silk, horses, metals, ivory, coral, amber, precious stones, velvets, brocades, broadcloth, perfumes drugs, Chinese porcelain and African slaves, and her exports were various textiles, pepper, indigo, opium and other drugs, saltpetre and miscellaneous goods. There were two main land routes for export trade on the north-west —from Lahore to Kābul and from Multān to Qandahār, while there were a few more in other parts. But the traffic along these routes was restricted and insecure. The sea and the rivers were more advantageous for commercial purposes. The chief ports of India were Lahorī Bandar in Sind; the group of Gujarāt ports like Surāt, Broach and Cambay; Bassein; Chaul; Dabul (modern Dabhol) in the Ratnagiri district; Goa and Bhatkal; Malābār ports, the most important of which were Calicut and Cochin; Negapatam, Masulipatam and a few minor ones on the east coast; and Sātgāon, Srīpur, Chittāgong and Sonārgāon in Bengal. The customs duties, fixed by the State, were not very high; for example, at Surāt these were 3½ per cent on all imports and exports of goods, and 2 per cent on money either gold or silver. No merchant was allowed to "carry any quantity of silver" out of the country. The important feature of the trade of India from the reign of Akbar

was the commercial activity of the English and the Dutch, who gradually established factories in widely distributed centres. As the demand for the costly European goods was confined to the wealthy, the European merchants had to import bullion from home to purchase Indian commodities in spite of strong criticism in England against this practice. Moreland's contention that the European traders in India during the Mughul period had not "matters all their own way" is supported by numerous references in the factory records of the time. While they had to experience difficulty in dealing with Indian merchants and brokers, who were "generally subtle and clever", and with commercial monopolies, the chief obstacle in their way was the interference of the local governors and other high officers. As an instance, we may note the evidence of an English letter of 1659 to the effect that Mīr Jumla had caused the doors of the English factory at Cāssimbāzār to be closed, and had forbidden anybody to trade with the English, until they had paid him a formal visit. The European traders spared no pains to humour and satisfy these officers in a variety of ways; sometimes they could gain their objects and sometimes they were disillusioned.

K. Economic Deterioration after the Reign of Aurangzeb

With the closing years of the reign of Aurangzeb, the economic prosperity of India deteriorated as a natural sequel to the disappearance of peace and political order. The incessant wars of the reign, bankruptcy of the administration and exhaustion of the exchequer, made maintenance of peace and order impossible; and consequently agriculture, industries, and trade were so badly affected that for some time trade came almost to a standstill. During the years 1690–1698, the English could not procure sufficient cloths for their shipping. "Thus ensued," observes the historian of Aurangzeb, "a great economic impoverishment of India—not only a decrease of the 'national stock', but also a rapid lowering of mechanical skill and standard of civilisation, a disappearance of art and culture over wide tracts of the country." Though comparatively free from wars, Bengal was put to a great economic strain as the revenues of the *subah* financed the Deccan wars of Aurangzeb and were sorely tapped by the rapidly declining Mughul Empire.

The economic decline of the country began much earlier than 1757, but a number of causes accelerated it, especially in Bengal, during the eighteenth century, which is indeed the "darkest age" in the economic history of India. The weakness of the central

government, court revolutions and conspiracies, the terrible Persian inroad of 1738–1739, the ravages committed by the Marāthas, the Himālayan tribes, the Mugs and the Portuguese pirates, the abuse of *dastaks* and other trade privileges by the servants, agents and *gomastās* of the English Company in their *private trade*, the Company's monopoly of some of the articles of prime necessity like salt, betelnut and tobacco, the oppression of merchants and weavers for the sake of a rich return on the investments of the Company, the huge drain of wealth out of the country since 1757, the oppressive revenue-farming system, and currency disorders—all combined to bring about the economic ruin of the country. To add to these, the gradual supplanting of the Nawāb's government by the East India Company, and the consequent disbandment of armies and disestablishment of courts and native secretariats, threw many people out of employment, who joined the ranks of the professional robbers and criminal tribes, and produced general lawlessness and insecurity during the post-Plassey period. In May, 1765, the Select Committee beheld Bengal as a "presidency divided, headstrong and licentious, a government without nerves, a treasury without money, and service without subordination, discipline, or public spirit . . . amidst a general stagnation of useful industry and of licensed commerce, individuals were accumulating immense riches, which they had ravished from the insulted prince and helpless people, who groaned under the united pressure of discontent, poverty and oppression".[1] The dual government of Clive and his two inefficient successors, Verelst and Cartier, made confusion worse confounded, and the terrible famine of 1770 filled the cup of popular misery. After 1772, when the Company's government decided "to stand forth as the Diwān", attempts were made by Warren Hastings and Cornwallis to remove some of these evils, but many years more were to elapse before a new order could be brought into existence.

[1] Letter from the Select Committee in Bengal to the Court of Directors dated 19th February, 1767. *Vide* Verelst, *View of Bengal*, Appendix, p. 471

CHAPTER VIII

EDUCATION, LITERATURE AND ART

1. Education and Literature

In Mughul India there was nothing like the modern system of education established and maintained by the State. But primary and secondary education of some sort existed. The rulers themselves, as well as many of the grandees, encouraged such education by grants of lands or money to mosques, monasteries and individual saints and scholars. Thus almost every mosque had a *maktab* attached to it, where the boys and girls of the neighbourhood received elementary education. Hindu Sanskritic and vernacular schools also continued to function for the benefit of students in the urban as well as rural areas.

The Mughul rulers of India were patrons of education. It is stated, on the authority of the *Tawārīkh* of Sayyid Maqbar 'Alī, a minister of Bābur, that one of the duties of the Public Works Department (*Shuhrat-i-Ām*) of that ruler's time was the building of schools and colleges. Humāyūn, though indolent and addicted to opium, had a passion for study, his favourite subjects being geography and astronomy; and his fondness for books was so great that he always "carried a select library with him". He caused a *madrāsā* to be established at Delhi and changed the pleasure-house built by Sher Shāh in the *Purāna Qil'ā* into a library. "Akbar's reign marks a new epoch for the system introduced for imparting education in schools and colleges". He built colleges at Fathpur Sīkrī, Āgra and other places. With a view to improving the state of Muslim education, he effected certain changes in its curriculum, which it would be unreasonable to say produced no effect at all. As a matter of fact, Abul Fazl, referring to its good results, writes that "all nations have schools for the education of youths; but Hindustān is particularly famous for its seminaries". Prompted by his policy of religious toleration, Akbar arranged in later years for the education of Hindus in *madrāsās*. Jahāngīr, possessed of some literary taste and well-read in Persian as well as Turkī, issued a regulation to the effect that on the death of a

rich man or traveller without any heir, his property would escheat to the crown and be utilised for building and repairing *madrāsās*, monasteries, etc. It is recorded in the *Ta'rīkh-i-Jān-Jahān* that, soon after his accession to the throne, Jahāngīr "repaired even these *madrāsās* that had for thirty years been the dwelling-places of birds and beasts, and filled them with students and professors". Shāh Jahān, though more interested in magnificent buildings than in anything else, was educated in his early youth in Turkī, spent a part of the night in his own studies, and encouraged learning by granting rewards and stipends to scholars. He founded one college at Delhi and repaired the college named *Dār-ul-Baqā* (Abode of Eternity), which had been almost in ruins. In Dārā Shukoh the Mughul imperial family possessed one of the greatest scholars that India has ever produced. Well-versed in Arabic, Persian and Sanskrit, he was the author of some famous works, including Persian translations of the *Upanishads*, the *Bhagavat Gītā* and the *Yoga Vāśishṭha Rāmāyaṇa*; a calendar of Muslim saints; and several works on Sūfī philosophy. Looking at the grave of this unlucky person, Sir William Sleeman rightly thought that had he lived to occupy the throne, the nature of education, and therewith the destiny of India, would have been different. Aurangzeb, though highly educated, did nothing substantial to promote learning in general, though he extended every encouragement to Muslim education, and founded, according to Keene, "numerous colleges and schools".

Female education of some sort existed during the Mughul period. The daughters of the imperial household, and of rich nobles, were given tuition in their houses, and we may assume that the daughters of the middle-class people among the Hindus received primary education along with the boys in the schools and that some of them were conversant with religious literature. The Auxiliary Committee of the Indian Statutory Commission rightly observed in September, 1929, that there is "nothing inherent either in the Hindu or in the Muslim religion which militates against the education of women. In fact, there were in India even in early days many examples of women possessing wide knowledge, particularly of sacred and classical literature". In Akbar's time "regular training was given to the ladies of the royal household". Some of the ladies so instructed distinguished themselves in the sphere of literature. Thus Bābur's daughter, Gulbadan Begam, authoress of the *Humāyūnnāmāh*, Humāyūn's niece, Salimā Sultānā, authoress of several Persian poems, Nūr Jahān, Mumtāz Mahal, Jahānārā Begam and Zeb-un-Nisā were highly educated ladies, well-read

in Persian and Arabic literature. Besides being a fine Arabic and Persian scholar, Zeb-un-Nisā was an expert in calligraphy and had a rich library.

As we have already noted, the Tīmūrīd rulers of India were patrons of literature and gave a considerable impetus to its development in different branches. Many scholars flourished and wrote interesting and important works under the patronage of Akbar. One of Akbar's contemporaries, Mādhavāchārya, a Bengali poet of Triveṇī and author of *Chandī-mangal*, bestows high praise on the Emperor as a patron of letters.

The Persian literature of Akbar's reign may be considered under three heads: (i) historical works, (ii) translations, and (iii) poetry and verse. The well-known historical works of the reign are the *Ta'rīkh-i-'Alfi* of Mullā Dāūd, the *'Āīn-i-Akbarī* and *Akbarnāmāh* of Abul Fazl, the *Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh* of Badāūnī, the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* of Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad, the *Akbarnāmāh* of Faizī Sarhindī, and the *Ma'āsir-i-Rahīmī* of 'Abdul Bāqī, compiled under the patronage of 'Abdur Rahīm Khān-i-Khānān. The most accomplished writer (in Persian) of the reign was Abul Fazl, a man of letters, a poet, an essayist, a critic, and a historian. By order of the Emperor, many books in Sanskrit and other languages were translated into Persian. Different sections of the *Mahābhārata* were translated into that language by several Muslim scholars and were compiled under the title of *Razm-Nāmāh*. After labouring for four years, Badāūnī completed the translation of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in A.D. 1589. Hājī Ibrāhīm Sarhindī translated into Persian the *Atharva Veda*; Faizī the *Lilābatī*, a work on mathematics; Mukammal Khān Gujarātī the *Tajak*, a treatise on astronomy; 'Abdur Rahīm Khān-i-Khānān the *Wāqiāt-i-Bāburī*; and Maulānā Shāh Muhammad Shāhābādī translated the *History of Kāshmīr*. Some Greek and Arabic works were also translated into Persian. A number of famous poets or versifiers produced works of merit under the patronage of Akbar. The most famous among the verse-writers was Ghizalī. Next in importance to him was Faizī, a brother of Abul Fazl. Other prominent poets were Muhammad Husain Nazirī of Nishāpur, who wrote *ghazals* of great merit, and Sayyid Jamāluddīn Urfi of Shirāj, the most famous writer of *Qasidās* in his days.

Jahāngīr, possessed of an excellent literary taste, also extended his patronage to scholars. His autobiography is second only to that of Bābur in matter and style. Among the learned men who adorned his court, of whom the *Iqbālnāmāh-i-Jahāngīrī* has given a comprehensive list, we may mention here the names of Ghiyās

Beg, Naqib Khān, Mu'tamid Khān, Niāmatullah and 'Abdul Haqq Dihlawī. Some historical works were written during Jahāngīr's reign, the most important of these being the *Ma'āsir-i-Jahāngīrī*, the *Iqbālnāmah-i-Jahāngīrī* and the *Zubd-ut-Tawārīkh*. Shāh Jahān followed his predecessors in patronising learned men. Besides many poets and theologians, there flourished in his court some famous writers of history like 'Abdul Hamīd Lāhorī, author of the *Pādshāh-nāmāh*, Amīnāī Qazwīnī, author of another *Pādshāhnāmāh*, Ināyat Khān, author of the *Shāh-Jahānnāmāh*, and Muhammad Sālih, author of *'Amal-i-Sālih*, all of whom are important authorities on the history of Shāh Jahān's reign. The scholarly works of Prince Dārā Shukoh, to which reference has already been made, are masterpieces of Persian literature. A zealous Sunnī, Aurangzeb was a critical scholar of Muslim theology and jurisprudence. He had no taste for poetry. Though opposed to the writing of histories of his reign, so that the *Muntakhab-ul-Lubāb* of Khāfī Khān had to be written in secrecy, there are some well-known works of this kind, such as the *'Ālamgīrnāmāh* by Mīrzā Muhammad Kāzim, the *Ma'āsir-i-'Ālamgīrī* of Muhammad Sāqī, the *Khulāsat-ut-Tawārīkh* of Sujan Rāi Khatri, the *Nushka-i-Dilkushā* of Bhīmsen and the *Fatūhāt-i-'Ālamgīrī* of Ishwar Dās.

The peace and order secured by Akbar, and the cosmopolitan ideas of the religious movements of the period, preached by a band of saintly teachers in a language "understanded of the people", stimulated the genius of the latter, which unfolded itself in manifold petals. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries consequently became "the Augustan age of Hindustani literature". The first writer of note after 1526 was Malik Muhammad Jayasī, who in 1540 wrote "the fine philosophic epic entitled the *Padmāvat*, which gives the story of Padminī, the queen of Mewār, in an allegorical setting". Akbar's keen interest in, and patronage of, Hindī poetry gave a great stimulus to Hindī literature. Among the courtiers of the Emperor, Bīrbal, who received from him the title of Kavi Priya, was a famous poet. Rājā Mān Singh also wrote verses in Hindi and was a patron of learning. The most distinguished writer among Akbar's ministers was 'Abdur Rahīm Khān-i-Khānān, whose *dohās* are even now read with interest and admiration all over Northern India. Narahari, whom the Emperor gave the title of Mahāpātra, Harināth and Ganj were also noted writers of his court.

The greater part of the poetical literature of the time was religious, marked by an exposition of either Krishna worship or the Rāma cult. Many writers of the former faith flourished in the Brajabhūmi, corresponding roughly to the Jumnā valley, where

it developed remarkably. Among the eight disciples of Vallabhāchārya and his son Bithal Nāth, grouped under the name of "*Astachāp*", the most notable was Surdās, "the blind bard of Āgra", who, writing in *Brajabhāshā*, described in his *Sursāgar* the sports of Kṛishṇa's early life, and composed many verses on the charm of Kṛishṇa and his beloved Rādhā. The other important poets of this school were Nand Dās, author of the *Rās-panchadhyāyī*, Vithal Nāth, author of the *Chaurāsī Vaishnava ki vārtā* in prose, Paramānanda Dās, Kumbhan Dās, and Ras Khān (a Muslim disciple of Vitchal Nāth), author of *Premavārtikā*. Among the writers of the Rāma cult, the most illustrious was Tulsī Dās (A.D. 1532–1623), who lived in Benares "unapproachable and alone in his niche in the temple of Fame". He was not merely a poet of a high order, but a spiritual teacher of the people of Hindustān, where his name has become a household word and his memory is worshipped by millions. The most famous of his works, known as *Rāmcharitamānasa*, *i.e.* "The Pool of Rāma's Life", has been justly described by Sir George Grierson as "the one Bible of a hundred millions of people" of Hindustān. Growse also observed in his translation of the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Tulsī Dās that "his book is in every one's hands, from the court to the cottage, and is read and heard and appreciated alike by every class of the Hindu community, whether high or low, rich or poor, young or old". This period was also marked by "the first attempts to systematise the art of poetry itself", made by writers like Keshava Dās (A.D. 1580), a Sāndhya Brāhmaṇa of Orchā, Sundar Senāpati and the Tripāthī brothers, who flourished during the reign of Shāh Jahān.

In Bengal, this period was remarkable for a brilliant outburst of the Vaishṇava literature. Its various branches, such as the *Karchās* or notes, the *padas* and songs, and the biographies of Chaitanya Deva, have not only saturated the minds of the people of Bengal with feelings of love and liberalism, but have also survived as a mirror of the social life of the province during that age. The most prominent Vaishṇava writers were Kṛishṇadās Kavirāj (born in A.D. 1517 of a Vaidya family of Jhāmālpur in Burdwān), the author of the most important biography of Chaitanya, bearing the title of *Chaitanyacharitāmitra*; Brindāvan Dās (born in A.D. 1507), the author of *Chaitanya Bhāgavata*, which besides being a standard work on the life of Chaitanya Deva, is a store-house of information concerning the Bengali society of his time; Jayānanda (born in A.D. 1513), the author of *Chaitanya Mangal*, a biographical work giving some fresh information about Chaitanya Deva's life; Trilochan Dās (born in A.D. 1523 at Kowgrām, a village situated

thirty miles to the north of Burdwān), the author of a very popular biography of Chaitanya Deva also known as *Chaitanya Mangal*; and Narahari Chakravarty, the author of *Bhaktiratnākar*, a voluminous biography of Chaitanya Deva, written in fifteen chapters and considered to be next in importance only to the work of Kṛishṇadās Kavirāj. This period also saw the production of numerous translations of the great epics and the *Bhāgavata*, and books in praise of Chandī Devī and Manasā Devī. The most important of these works were the *Mahābhārata* of Kāsīrām Dās and the *Kavikankan Chandī* of Mukundarām Chakravarti, which enjoys to this day as much popularity in Bengal as the famous book of Tulsī Das in upper India. Mukundarām's work depicts a graphic picture of the social and economic conditions of the people of Bengal of his time, and it is for this that Prof. Cowell has described him as "the Crabbe of Bengal", and Dr. Grierson considers his poetry "as coming from the heart, and not from the school, and as full of passages adorned with true poetry and descriptive power".

The Emperors' fondness for books led to the foundation of libraries, which were stocked with numerous valuable manuscript works. Akbar's library had enormous collections, which were properly classified under different sections. The art of calligraphy reached a high state of excellence. Among the famous penmen of Akbar's court, of whom the *'Āīn-i-Akbarī* has preserved a list, the most distinguished was Muhammad Husain of Kāshmīr, who got the title of *Zarrinqalam* (Gold-pen).

The growth of Hindī literature received a setback during the reign of Aurangzeb, owing to the stoppage of court patronage. Not much Urdu poetry also was written in Northern India during this period; but some famous writers of Urdu verse flourished in the Deccan.

Literary activity did not entirely cease even in the troubled days of later Mughul rule. Men of letters were patronised by Emperors like Bahādur Shāh and Muhammad Shāh, *subahdārs* like Murshid Qulī Jāfar Khān and 'Ālīvardī Khān, and zamindārs like Rājā Kṛishṇachandra of Nadiā, Asadullāh of Bīrbhūm and some others. The literature of this period, with the exception of the devotional songs of Rāmprasād, was often of a low tone and a vitiated taste. Female education, both among the Hindus and the Muslims, was not unknown to the age. The two daughters of Jan Muhammad, a converted Hindu and father of the well-known Kokī Jiu, were "sent to school and attained some proficiency in letters". Kokī Jiu "excelled her brothers in handwriting and composition". In

Bengal, we find several instances of educated ladies; for example, the wives of Rājā Navskṛishṇa of Sobhābāzār (in Calcutta) were famous for their capacity to read, and Ānandamayī of East Bengal was a poetess of no mean repute.

2. Art and Architecture

A. Architecture

As in literature and religion, so in art and architecture, the Mughul period was not entirely an age of innovation and renaissance, but of a continuation and culmination of processes that had their beginnings in the later Turko-Afghān period. In fact, the art and architecture of the period after 1526, as also of the preceding period, represent a happy mingling of Muslim and Hindu art traditions and elements.

With the exception of Aurangzeb, whose puritanism could not reconcile itself with patronage of art, all the early Mughul rulers of India were great builders. Brief though his Indian reign was, Bābur could make time to criticise in his *Memoirs* the art of building in Hindustān and think of constructing edifices. He is said to have invited from Constantinople pupils of the famous Albanian architect, Sinān, to work on mosques and other monuments in India. "It is, however, very unlikely," remarks Mr. Percy Brown, "that this proposal ever came to anything, because had any member of this famous school taken service under the Mughuls, traces of the influence of the Byzantine style would be observable. But there is none. . . ." Bābur employed Indian stone-masons to construct his buildings. He himself states in his *Memoirs* that "680 men worked daily on his buildings at Āgra, and that nearly 1,500 were employed daily on his buildings at Sīkrī, Biyāna, Dholpur, Gwālior and Kiul". The larger edifices of Bābur have entirely disappeared. Three minor ones have survived, one of which is a commemorative mosque in the Kābulī Bāg at Pānīpat (1526), another the *Jāmi' Masjid* at Sambhal (1526) in Rohilkhand, and the third a mosque within the old Lodī fort at Āgra. Of the reign of the unlucky emperor Humāyūn, only two structures remain in a semi-dilapidated condition, one mosque at Āgra, and the other a massive well-proportioned mosque at Fathbād in the Hissār district of the Punjab, built about A.D. 1540 with enamelled tile decoration in the Persian manner. It should be noted here that this "Persian" or rather "Mongol" trait was not brought to India for the first time by Humāyūn, but had already been present in

the Bahmanī kingdom in the later half of the fifteenth century. The short reign of the Indo-Afghān revivalist Sher Shāh is a period of transition in the history of Indian architecture. The two remaining gateways of his projected walled capital at Delhi, which could not be completed owing to his untimely death, and the citadel known as the *Purāna Qil'ā*, exhibit "a more refined and artistically ornate type of edifice than had prevailed for some time". The mosque called the *Qil'a-i-Kuhna Masjid*, built in 1545 within the walls, deserves a high place among the buildings of Northern

Sher Shah's Mausoleum, Sasaram

India for its brilliant architectural qualities. Sher Shāh's mausoleum, built on a high plinth in the midst of a lake at Sasarām in the Shāhābād district of Bihār, is a marvel of Indo-Moslem architecture, both from the standpoint of design and dignity, and shows a happy combination of Hindu and Muslim architectural ideas. Thus not only in government, but also in culture and art, the great Afghān prepared the way for the great Mughul, Akbar.

Akbar's reign saw a remarkable development of architecture. With his usual thoroughness, the Emperor mastered every detail of the art; and, with a liberal and synthetic mind he supplied himself with artistic ideas from different sources, which were

given a practical shape by the expert craftsmen he gathered around him. Abul Fazl justly observes that his sovereign "planned splendid edifices and dressed the work of his mind and heart in the garment of stone and clay". Fergusson aptly remarked that Fathpur Sīkrī "was a reflex of the mind of a great man". Akbar's activities were not confined only to the great

CARVED PILLARS IN SULTANA'S HOUSE, FATHPUR SIKRĪ

masterpieces of architecture; but he also built a number of forts, villas, towers, *sarāis*, schools, tanks and wells. While still adhering to Persian ideas, which he inherited from his mother, born of a Persian Shaikh family of Jām, his tolerance of the Hindus, sympathy with their culture, and the policy of winning them over to his cause, led him to use Hindu styles of architecture in many of his buildings, the decorative features of which are copies of those found

DELHI GATE, AGRA FORT

in the Hindu and Jaina temples. It is strikingly illustrated in the *Jahāngīrī Mahal*, in Āgra fort, with its square pillars and bracket-capitals, and rows of small arches built according to the Hindu design without voussoirs; in many of the buildings of Fathpur Sīkrī, the imperial capital from 1569 to 1584; and also in the Lahore fort. Even in the famous mausoleum of Humāyūn at Old Delhi, completed early in A.D. 1569, which is usually considered to have displayed influences of Persian art, the ground-plan of the tomb is Indian, the free use of white marble in the outward appearance of

JAHĀNGĪRĪ MAHAL, ĀGRA FORT

the edifice is Indian, and the coloured tile decoration, used so much by Persian builders, is absent. The most magnificent of the Emperor's buildings at Fathpur Sīkrī are Jodh Bāi's palace and two other residential buildings, said to have been constructed to accommodate his queens; the *Diwān-i-'Am* or the Emperor's office, of Hindu design with a projecting veranda roof over a colonnade; the wonderful *Diwān-i-Khās* or Hall of private audience, of distinctly Indian character in planning, construction and ornament; the marble mosque known as the *Jāmi' Masjid*, described by Fergusson as "a romance in stone"; the *Buland Darwāza* or the massive

triumphal archway at the southern gate of the mosque, built of marble and sandstone to commemorate Akbar's conquest of Gujarāt; and the pyramidal structure in five storeys known as the *Panch Mahal*, showing continuation of the plan of the Indian Buddhist *vihāras* which still exist in certain parts of India. Two other remarkable buildings of the period are the Palace of Forty Pillars at Allahābād and Akbar's mausoleum at Sikandara. The palace at Allahābād, the construction of which, according to William Finch, took forty years and engaged 5,000 to 20,000

TOMB OF HUMĀYŪN, DELHI

workmen of different denominations, is of a definitely Indian design with its projecting veranda-roof "supported on rows of Hindu pillars". The colossal structure of Akbar's mausoleum at Sikandara, planned in the Emperor's lifetime but executed between A.D. 1605 and 1613, consists of five terraces diminishing as they ascend with a vaulted roof to the topmost storey of white marble, and it is thought that a central dome was originally intended to be built over the cenotaph. The Indian design in this structure was inspired by the Buddhist *viharās* of India and also probably by Khmer architecture found in Cochin-China.

JODH BÂI'S PALACE, FATHPUR SÎKRÎ



AKBAR'S MAUSOLEUM, SIKANDARA

The number of buildings erected during Jahāngīr's reign was poor as compared with the architectural record of his father, but two structures of his time are of exceptional interest and merit. One is the mausoleum of Akbar, whose striking features have been already discussed. The other is the tomb of I'timād-ud-daulah at Āgra built by his daughter, Nūr Jahān, the consort of Jahāngīr. The latter was built wholly of white marble decorated with *pietra dura* work in semi-precious stones. We have an earlier specimen of this work in the *Gol Mandal* temple at Udaipur (from

GOL MANDAL OR MAHAL, JAGMANDIR, UDAIPUR

A.D. 1600). It was therefore a Rājput style, or, most probably, an older Indian style.

Shāh Jahān was a prolific builder. Many buildings, palaces, forts, gardens and mosques due to him are to be found at places like Āgra, Delhi, Lahore, Kābul, Kāshmīr, Qandahār, Ajmer, Ahmadābād, Mukhlispur, and elsewhere. Though it is not possible to form a precise estimate of the expenditure on these buildings, yet there is no doubt that the cost must have run into several dozen crores of rupees. The structures of Shāh Jahān, as compared with those of Akbar, are inferior in grandeur and originality, but they are superior in lavish display and rich and skilful decoration, so that the architecture of the former "becomes jewellery on a

DIWĀN-I-KHĀS, DELHI



DIWĀN-I-AM, DELHI

bigger scale". This is particularly illustrated in his Delhi buildings like the *Diwān-i-'Am* and the *Diwān-i-Khās*. The latter, with its costly silver ceiling, and mingled decoration of marble, gold and precious stones, justified the inscription engraved on it:

> "*Agar firdaus bar ru-yi zamin ast*,
> *Hamin ast, u hamin ast, u hamin ast.*"
> (If on Earth be an Eden of bliss,
> It is this, it is this, none but this.)

MOTI MASJID AT ĀGRA

The lovely *Moti Masjid* or Pearl Mosque at Āgra deserves a higher place from the standpoint of true art for its purity and elegance. Another notable building of the reign is the *Jāmi' Masjid* at Āgra, otherwise known as the *Masjid-i-Jahān Nāmā*. The *Tāj Mahal*, a splendid mausoleum built by Shāh Jahān, at a cost of fifty lacs of rupees, over the grave of his beloved wife, Mumtāz Mahal, is rightly regarded as one of the wonders of the world for its beauty and magnificence. As regards the identity of the architects who designed and built the Tāj, Smith's contention that it is "the product of a combination of European and Asiatic genius" has been challenged by Moin-ud-dīn Ahmad, who advances reasonable grounds



JĀMI' MASJID, ĀGRA

Taj Mahal, Agra

for disbelieving the supposed participation of Italian or French architects in the designing or construction of this noble monument of conjugal fidelity and gives the credit for the design to Ustād 'Īsā. While studying the Tāj, a student of Indian art should not fail to note certain points. Firstly, the plan and chief features of it were not entirely novel, for "from Sher's mausoleum, and through Humāyūn's tomb and the Bijāpur memorials, the descent of the style can easily be discerned"; even the "lace-work in marble and other stones, and precious stones inlay (*pietra dura*) work on marble" were already present in Western India and Rājput art. Secondly, "the lavish use of white marble and some decorations of Indian character" lead us to think that there is no reason to overemphasise the domination of Persian influence in Shāh Jahān's buildings as is usually done. Thirdly, considering the intercourse of India with the Western world, particularly the Mediterranean region, during the Mughul period, it would not be historically inconsistent to believe in the influence of some elements of art of the Western world on the art of India during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and also in the presence of some European builders in different parts of contemporary India.

Though not so famous as the Tāj, the mausoleum of Jahāngīr, built by Shāh Jahān at an early date at Shāhdara in Lahore, is a beautiful specimen of art. Another celebrated work of art of this reign was the Peacock Throne. "The throne was in the form of a cot bedstead on golden legs. The enamelled canopy was supported by twelve emerald pillars, each of which bore two peacocks encrusted with gems. A tree covered with diamonds, emeralds, rubies, and pearls stood between the birds of each pair." Nādir Shāh removed the throne to Persia in 1739, but unfortunately it is no longer to be found anywhere in this world.

In Aurangzeb's reign the style of architecture began to deteriorate. If not openly hostile to architecture, the puritanic Emperor ceased to encourage it, or to erect buildings, like his predecessors. The few structures of his reign, the most important of which was the Lahore mosque, completed in A.D. 1674, were but feeble imitations of the older models. Soon the creative genius of the Indian artists mostly disappeared, surviving partly in Oudh and Hyderābād in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

B. Painting

Like architecture, painting in the Mughul period represented a happy mingling of extra-Indian as well as Indian elements. A

THE MAUSOLEUM OF JAHÂNGÎR AT SHÂHDARA, LAHORE

provincialised form of Chinese art, which was a mixture of Indian Buddhist, Iranian, Bactrian and Mongolian influences, was introduced into Persia in the thirteenth century by its Mongol conquerors and was continued by their Tīmūrīd successors, who again imported it into India. The characteristics of this Indo-Sino-Persian art were assimilated, mingled and combined, in the time of Akbar, in products of the contemporary Indian schools of painting, which flourished, as a renaissance of earlier Hindu, Buddhist and Jaina styles, in different parts of the country, such as Gujarāt, Rājputāna, Vijayanagar, Bijāpur, Ahmadnagar and some other places, and led to the development of a style of painting in which the Mongoloid elements gradually declined and the Indian ones predominated. This modification can be clearly seen in the paintings in the copies of the *Khāndān-i-Tīmūrīā* and the *Pādshāhnāmāh*, both of which are preserved in the Khudābakhsh Library of Patna.

It is possible that Bābur, who was "always keenly observant of the beauties of Nature", patronised the art of painting, like his Tīmūrīd ancestors, according to his limited resources. The paintings in the Alwar MS. of the Persian version of his *Memoirs* probably represent the style that grew up in his time. Humāyūn, who, like other Tīmūrīds, possessed a taste for art, spent his hours of exile in Persia in studying Sino-Persian music, poetry and painting and came in contact with the leading artists of Persia, who flourished under the generous patronage of Shāh Tahmāsp. Two of them—Mīr Sayyid 'Alī, a pupil of the famous Bihzād of Herāt, who has been styled "the Raphael of the East", and Khwāja 'Abdus Samād—were persuaded to come to his court at Kābul in A.D. 1550. Humāyūn and his son Akbar took lessons from them in the art of painting and engaged them in the task of preparing the illustrations to the *Dāstān-i-Amīr Hamzah*. These two foreign artists, working with their Indian assistants, "formed the nucleus of the Mughul school of painting", which became so prominent in the time of Akbar. This passed on as a valuable gift from Humāyūn to Akbar, while his political legacy was precarious.

In the illustrative paintings to *Amīr Hamzah*, done by Sayyid 'Alī and 'Abdus Samād between A.D. 1550 and A.D. 1560, the Sino-Persian influence was still predominant. But in 1562, when the famous painting showing the arrival at the Mughul Court of the Vaishṇava musician, Tānsen, was executed, the fusion of Hindu and Sino-Persian styles began to manifest itself. From A.D. 1569 to 1585 the walls of Akbar's new capital at Fathpur Sīkrī were embellished with the masterpieces of the painter's art by the joint labours of the artists of the Hindu and Persian schools, both being

ready to imbibe and utilise new ideas and thus facilitating the growth of a new school of art. The Persian or other foreign artists in Akbar's court were few in number, the most famous of them being 'Abdus Samad, Farrukh Beg, who was of Kalmuck origin, Khursau Qulī and Jamshed. The Hindu artists predominated in number. Of the seventeen leading artists of Akbar's reign, no less than thirteen were Hindus. Abul Fazl thus refers to the standard of their art: "More than a hundred painters have become famous masters of the art, while the number of those who attain perfection, or of those who are middling, is very large. This is specially true of the Hindus, their pictures surpass our conception of things. Few indeed in the whole world are found equal to them." They worked in collaboration and excelled in portraiture, book-illustration and illumination and animal painting. Chief among them were Basawān, Lāl, Kesu, Mukund, Haribans and Daswanth. The last-named belonged to the Kāhār or palanquin-bearer caste, while the rest belonged to the Kāyastha, Chitera, Silāvat and Khatri castes and were drawn from different parts of the country.

Akbar, who shared with others of his race "an intense appreciation of the wonder and glory of the world", encouraged pictorial art in every possible way and gave it a religious outlook in spite of the Islamic injunction regarding the representation of living forms. "It appears to me," said he, "as if a painter had quite peculiar means of recognising God; for if a painter in sketching anything that has life, and in devising its limbs, one after the other comes to feel that he cannot bestow individuality on his work, he is forced to think of God, the Giver of life, and will thus increase his knowledge." In this way he sought to remove the discontent of the orthodox Muslims, who were opposed to the art of painting. "Bigoted followers of the letter of the law," writes Abul Fazl, "are hostile to the art of painting, but their eyes now see the truth."

The school of art that grew up under Akbar continued to flourish in the reign of Jahāngīr through the enthusiastic support and patronage of the latter. Jahāngīr was an excellent connoisseur, who paid high prices for any pictures that satisfied his aesthetic taste, and an art critic who could tell the names of individual artists in a composite piece. The famous Muslim artists of his court were Āgā Rezā and his son, Abul Hasan, of Herāt; Muhammad Nādir and Muhammad Murād from Samarqānd, who were among the last foreign artists to come to India; and Ustād Mansūr. Among the Hindu painters of this reign, Bishan Dās, Manohar and Govardhan were the most eminent. Himself having a fair acquaintance with

the classical aspects of miniature painting, the Emperor frequently purchased examples of the best schools of art in India or abroad; and his zeal, combined with the skill of his artists, led to the emancipation of Mughul pictorial art from the tutelage of Persian influences and to the development of an art style essentially Indian.

With Jahāngīr, however, according to Percy Brown, the real spirit of Mughul pictorial art declined. Shāh Jahān did not possess the same passion for painting as his father, and his tastes were more for architecture and jewellery. The court portraiture and *darbār* pictures of his reign were characterised by rich pigments and a lavish use of gold rather than by the harmonious blend of colours which was present in Jahāngīr's art. He reduced the number of court painters, and the art of painting was soon deprived of imperial patronage. In the imperial family only Dārā Shukoh was a patron of art, as is proved by his album now preserved in the India Office, and his untimely death was a great blow to art as well as to the Empire. The artists were compelled to seek employment under nobles, as in Rājputāna and the Himālayan states, set up studios in the *bāzārs* and sell their pictures, as a means of livelihood, to the general public, whose number was, however, limited. Bernier noted that the artists had no chance of attaining distinction and worked under adverse circumstances and for poor remuneration.

The reign of Aurangzeb saw a distinct decline of pictorial art, as the Emperor regarded its patronage as opposed to the precepts of sacred law. Large numbers of portraits of him in various situations were indeed drawn, with or without his consent, and he is said to have inspected at intervals the portrait of his rebellious son Muhammad Sultān, painted by his order, to know his condition in prison. But he is reported to have defaced the paintings in the Asār Mahal at Bijāpur, and Manucci writes that under his orders the figures in Akbar's mausoleum at Sikandara were whitewashed. With the disintegration of the Mughul Empire after the death of Aurangzeb, some of the surviving painters migrated from the capital to the states of Oudh, Hyderābād, Mysore and Bengal, which had made themselves practically independent, and some went to Lucknow and Patna. But both the support that they got and the work that they executed were far inferior to what had been the case under the Great Mughuls.

In the eighteenth century a style of painting noted for brilliancy and decorative effect flourished in Rājputāna, particularly in Jaipur. In the latter half of the century, highly beautiful and refined pictures were painted by the Kāngrā school, of which the Tehrī-Garhwāl school was an offshoot; and in the early nineteenth

century this developed into Sikh portrait painting. Recently, artists both in India and Europe have begun to appreciate Mughul and Rājput paintings and are trying to revive the style.

C. Music

Indian rulers like the 'Ādil Shāhī Sultāns of Bijāpur and Bāz Bahādur of Mālwa, a contemporary of Akbar, and all the Great Mughuls, with the exception of Aurangzeb, appreciated the art of music. Akbar, Jahāngīr, and Shāh Jahān extended considerable patronage to it, which led to the improvement of its quality and to its being widely cultivated. According to Abul Fazl, thirty-six singers enjoyed the patronage of Akbar's court. Of them, the most famous were Tānsen, about whom Abul Fazl writes that "a singer like him has not been in India for the last thousand years"; and Bāz Bahādur of Mālwa, who was employed in the service of Akbar, and has been described as "the most accomplished man of his day in the science of music and in Hindi song". Aurangzeb positively discouraged music and placed a ban upon it.

THE SO-CALLED SLAVE DYNASTY, 1206–90


I. Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak, d. 1210
(Slave of Mu'iz-ud-dīn Muhammad Ghūrī)
II. Ārām (adopted?) d. 1211
Daughter = III. Ilbarī Turk Shams-ud-dīn Iltutmish (Slave) d. May 1, 1236.
Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd (Bengal.)
IV. Rukn-ud-dīn Fīrūz Shāh, deposed and killed Nov. 1236.
VII. 'Alā-ud-dīn Ma'sūd, deposed June 1246.
V. (Daughter) Raziyya, deposed May 1240 d. Oct. 1240
VI. Mu'iz-ud-dīn Bahrām. d. May 15, 1242
VIII. Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd. d. Feb. 1266
Daughter
? Daughter = (Slave) IX. Ghiyās-ud-dīn Balban. d. 1287.
Prince Muhammad =
X. Mu'iz-ud-dīn, Kaiqubād, killed 1290.
XI. Kayūmars.
Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd Bughrā Khān (Bengal)

THE KHALJĪ SULTĀNS OF DELHI, 1290–1320


Qaim Khān (Tūlak Khān of Qunduz)
Khaljīs of Mālwa.
I. Jalāl-ud-dīn, Fīrūz Shāh, d. July 21, 1296.
Masūd (Shihāb-ud-dīn).
II. Rukn-ud-dīn, Ibrāhīm, deposed Nov. 1296.
III. 'Alā-ud-dīn Sikandar Sāni, Muhammad Shāh. d. Jan. 1316.
Prince Khizr Khān.
IV. Shihāb-ud-dīn 'Umar. d. April, 1316.
V. Qutb-ud-dīn Mubārak. d.c. April, 1320.
VI. Nāsir-ud-dīn Khusrav (usurper). d.c. Sept. 1320.

THE HOUSE OF TUGHLUQ, 1320–1413


I. (Turkī Slave of Balban) Ghiyās-ud-dīn (Ghāzī Malik) Tughluq Shāh I. d. Feb. 1325.
Rajab = Bhatti Princess Sipāh Sālār.
II. Muhammad, Jauna d. March 20, 1351.
III. Fīrūz Shāh, d. Sept. 20, 1388.
Fath Khān
Zāfar Khān
V. Abu Baqr, deposed Dec. 1390
VI. Nāsir-ud-dīn, Muhammad Shāh d. Jan. 20, 1394.
IV. Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq (II) deposed and killed 1389
VIII. Nusrat Shāh, disputed succession. Set up in Jan. 1395; d. 1398 or 1399
VII. Alā-ud-dīn Sikandar (Humāyūn Khān), d. March 8, 1394.
IX. Mahmūd Shāh. d. Feb. 1413

THE SAYYID RULERS OF DELHI, 1414–1451

I. Khizr Khān
May 28, 1414; d. May 20, 1421.

II. Mu'iz-ud-dīn, Mubārak.
Killed 1434

Farid Khān

III. Muhammad Shāh
d. 1445.

IV. 'Alā-ud-dīn, 'Ālam Shāh
d. 1453.
(Removed to Badāūn, 1451).

THE LODĪ DYNASTY OF DELHI, 1451–1526

I. Buhlūl Lodī, d. July, 1489.

Bārbak Shāh
(Jaunpur).

II. Nizām Khān, Sikandar Lodī
d. Nov. 21, 1517.

'Ālam

III. Ibrāhīm Lodī
d. April 21, 1526

KINGS OF BENGAL

(1) Eastern Bengal

Fakhr-ud-dīn Mubārak Shāh	1336 or 1338
Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn Ghāzī Shāh	1346–1352

(2) Western Bengal and all Bengal

'Alā-ud-dīn 'Alī Shāh	1339
Hājī Shams-ud-dīn Iliyās Shāh, Bhangara	1345
Sikandar Shāh	1357
Ghiyās-ud-dīn A'zam Shāh	1398
Saif-ud-dīn Hamza Shāh	1410
Shihāb-ud-dīn Bāyazīd	1412
Ganesh of Bhāturiā (Kāns Narāyan)	1414
Jadu, alias Jalāl-ud-dīn Muhammad Shāh	1414
Danuja-mardana	1417
Mahendra	1418
Shams-ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh	1431
Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh	1442
Rukn-ud-dīn Bārbak Shāh	1460
Shams-ud-dīn Yūsuf Shāh	1474
Sikandar Shāh II	1481
Jalāl-ud-dīn Fath Shāh	1481
Bārbak the Eunuch, Sultān Shāhzāda	1486
Malik Indīl, Fīrūz Shāh	1486
Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh II	1489
Sidī Badr, Shams-ud-dīn Muzaffar Shāh	1490

KINGS OF BENGAL—*continued.*

Sayyid 'Alā-ud-dīn Husain Shāh	1493
Nasīr-ud-dīn Nusrat Shāh	1518
'Alā-ud-dīn Firūz Shāh	1533
Ghiyās-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh	1533
Humāyūn, Emperor of Delhi	1538
Sher Shāh Sūr	1539
Khizr Khān	1540
Muhammad Khān Sūr	1545
Khizr Khān, Bahādur Shāh	1555
Ghiyās-ud-dīn Jalāl Shāh	1561
Son of preceding	1564
Tāj Khān Karārānī	1564
Sulaimān Karārānī	1572
Bāyazīd Khan Karārānī	1572
Dāūd Khān Karārānī	1572–1576

HOUSE OF ILIYĀS



SAYYID KINGS OF BENGAL



KARARĀNĪ DYNASTY



BAHMANI KINGS OF THE DECCAN



RĀNĀS OF MEWĀR (From Ari Simha)



RĀNĀS OF MEWĀR (From Ari Simha)—*contd.*



YĀDAVAS OF VIJAYANAGAR



TULUVA AND ĀRAVĪDU KINGS OF VIJAYANAGAR, etc.



SŪR KINGS, 1540–1555


Ibrāhīm Khān
Hasan Khān
GhāzīKhān
(Name unknown)
I. Farid Khān, then Sher Khān (Sher Shāh) Killed May 22, 1545
Nizām Khān
Sulaiman Ahmad and others
IV. Ibrāhīm Khān, Ibrāhīm Shāh, married sister of 'Ādilī; fled from upper India; killed in Orissa between July 1567 and July 1568.
V. Ahmad Khān Sikandar Shāh, married sister of 'Ādilī, retired to hills, 1556; expelled by Akbar, 1557; fled to Bengal and died, 1558–1559.
II. Islām (Salīm) Shāh = d. November, 1554
Daughter
III. Mubāriz Khān Muhammad 'Ādil Shāh ('Ādilī or Audhlī) killed at Monghyr, 1556
Daughter married to Ibrāhīm No. IV
Daughter married to Sikandar No. V
Fīrūz Shāh murdered November, 1554

TIMŪRĪD DYNASTY—THE FIRST SIX RULERS

So-called "Barlās Turks", "Chaghātai Gurgani", or Mughul Emperors



THE LATER TIMŪRĪDS

VI. Muhi-ud-dīn **Muhammad** Aurangzeb, 'Ālamgīr I
d. 1707

- **Muhammad Sultān** died 1676
- VII. Mu'azzam, Shāh 'Ālām I Bahādur Shāh I (acc. 1707, d. 1712)
  - VIII. Muiz-ud-dīn Jahāndār Shāh killed 1713
    - XIV(a) 'Azīz-ud-dīn 'Ālamgīr II (acc. 1754, killed 1759)
      - XV(a) Mīrzā 'Abdullah 'Alī Gohar, Shāh 'Ālam II (acc. 1759, blinded 1788, d. 1806)
        - XVI. Akbar Shāh II (acc. 1806, d. 1837)
          - **XVII. Bahādur Shāh II, (acc. 1837, deposed 1858 at the time of the Sepoy Mutiny and d. 1862)**
  - 'Azīm-us-Shān
    - IX. Muhammad Farrukhsiyar (acc. 1713, murdered 1719)
  - Rafī-ul-Qadr, Rafī-us-Shān
    - XII(b) Muhammad Ibrāhīm (1720)
    - XI. Rafī-ud-daulah (Shāh Jahān II acc. and death 1719)
    - X(a) Rafī-ud-Darajāt (acc. and death 1719)
  - Khujistah Akhtar, Jahān Shāh (killed in battle)
    - XII(a) Muhammad Shāh (acc. 1719, d. 1748)
      - XIII. Ahmad Shāh (acc. 1748, deposed 1754)
        - XV(b) Bīdār Bakht (1788)
- Muhammad A'zam (killed at Jājau 1707)
  - Bīdār Bakht (killed at Jājau)
- Akbar (d. in Persia 1704 or 1706)
  - X(b) Nekusiyar (1719)
- Kām Bakhsh (killed near Hyderābād, 1708)
  - Muhi-us-Sunnat
    - XIV(b) Shāh Jahān III

BHONSLAS (CHHATRAPATI)



THE PESHWÁS


Viswanāth
I. Bālājī Viswanāth (1713)
II. Bājī Rāo I (1720)
Chimnājī Āppā
III. Bālājī Bājī Rāo (1740)
VI. Raghunāth Rāo (Raghoba) (1773)
Vishwās Rāo
IV. Mādhava Rāo Ballāl (1761)
V. Nārāyan Rāo (1772)
VII. Mādhava Rāo Nārāyan (1774)
Amrita Rāo (adopted)
IX. Bājī Rāo II (1796–1818)
VIII. Chimnājī Āppā (1796)
Vināyak Rāo
Nānā Sāheb (adopted)

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO PART II, BOOK I

GENERAL

1. Cambridge History of India, Vol. III.
2. Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Vol. II—H. Nelson Wright.
3. History and Culture of the Indian People. Published by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, Vol. VI.
4. Historical Inscriptions of Southern India—Sewell and Aiyangar.
5. Medieval India—Ishwari Prasad.
6. Medieval India under Muhammadan Rule—Lane-Poole.
7. Oxford History of India—V. A. Smith.
8. The Sultanate of Delhi—A. L. Srivastava.

SPECIAL

Chapter I

1. Al Biruni's India—Sachau. (Trubner's Oriental Series.)
2. Chronicles of the Pathān Kings of Delhi—Edward Thomas. London, 1871.
3. Ferishta—Briggs.
4. History of India as told by its own Historians, Vols. I and II (Chachnāmah, Al-Bilādūri, Ma'sūdī and Ta'rīkh-i-Yamīnī by Al 'Utbī).—H. M. Elliot and J. Dowson.
5. Mihirān of Sind and its Tributaries, in Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1892—Major H. G. Raverty.
6. Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh—'Abdul Qādir Badāūnī. English translation of Vol. I by Lt.-Colonel G. S. A. Ranking.
7. Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī—Minhāj-ud-dīn Sirāj. English translation by Major H. G. Raverty.
8. The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India—A. B. M. Habibullah

Chapter II

1. Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 of Chapter I.
2. Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, 1911–12.
3. Tāj-ul-Ma'āsir—Hasan-un-Nizāmī. Elliot and Dowson. Vol. III.

4. History of Bengal—Stewart.
5. Indian Historical Quarterly, March, 1937.
6. Riyāz-us-salātīn—Ghulām Husain Salīm (English translation).
7. Ta'rīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī—Ziā-ud-dīn Barnī (Bibliotheca Indica series of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, 1862, and Elliot and Dowson, Vol. III).

Chapter III

1. Nos. 6 and 7 of Chapter II.
2. Amīr Khusrav, Ta'rīkh-i-'Alai—Elliot and Dowson, Vol. III.
3. Chronicles of the Pathān Kings of Delhi—Thomas.
4. Elliot and Dowson, Vol. IV.
5. Historic Landmarks of the Deccan, 1907—Major T. W. Haig.
6. Historical Inscriptions of Southern India—Sewell and Aiyangar.
7. Journal of Indian History, 1929.
8. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1875.
9. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1895.
10. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1909.
11. South India and Her Muhammadan Invaders—S. K. Aiyangar.
11a. The Khaljis—K. S. Lal.
12. Ta'rīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī—Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afīf. (Khudābakhsh Library copy). It is a continuation of Barnī's work carried down to A.D. 1388.
13. Ta'rīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī (English translation of Sir J. N. Sarkar's copy by Prof. K. K. Basu).
14. Taziyat-ul-Amsār—Wassāf. Elliot and Dowson, Vol. III.
15. Travels of Ibn Batūtah (French edition by C. Defremery and B. R. Sanguinetti, Vol. III).
16. Travels of Marco Polo—Yule.

Chapter IV

Same as Bibliography to Chapter III and

1. Calcutta Review, 1874.
2. Fatuhāt-i-Fīrūz-Shāhī—Elliot and Dowson, Vol. III.
3. History of the Qaraunah Turks—Ishwari Prasad.
4. Indian Culture, July 1938.
5. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1874.
6. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1922.

Chapter V

1. The First Afghan Empire in India—A. B. Pandey.

Bengal

1. Bānglār Itihāser Duso Bachhar: Sādhin Sultānder Āmal (1338–1538 A.D.) (in Bengali)—Sukhomaya Mukhopadhyaya, July,1962.
2. Chronicles of the Pathān Kings of Delhi—Thomas.
3. Coins and Chronology of the Early Independent Sultāns of Bengal—Nalini Kanta Bhattasali.
4. Dacca Review, 1915.
5. History of Bengal—Stewart.
6. History of Bengal, Part II—R. D. Banerjee.
7. Ibn Batūtah, Vol. III.
8. Initial Coinage of Bengal—Thomas.
9. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1872 and 1873.
10. Riyāz-us-salātīn—Ghulām Husain Salīm (English translation).
11. Ta'rīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī—Barnī.
12. Ta'rīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī—Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afīf.

Independent Sultānates in Northern and Western India

1. An Arabic History of Gujarāt: Text edited by Sir E. Denison Ross, Vol. I, 1910, and Vol. II, 1921.
2. Ferishta—Briggs.
3. Local Muhammadan Dynasties of Gujarāt, Mirāt-i-Sikandarī—Bayley.
4. Muhammadan Kings of Kāshmīr, in Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1918—Wolseley Haig.
5. Square Silver Coins of the Sultāns of Kāshmīr, in Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1885—C. J. Rogers.
6. Ta'rīkh-i-Rashīdī—Mīrzā Haidar, translated by Sir E. Denison Ross, with commentary, notes and map by Ney Elias.
7. History of Kashmir—Mohibul Hasan Khan.
8. Journal of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, Vol. XXI.

Khāndesh and the Bahmani Kingdom

1. Ferishta—Briggs.
2. Historic Landmarks of the Deccan—Major T. W. Haig.
3. Indian Antiquary, 1899.
4. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1904.
5. Journal of Indian History, April, 1937.

Vijayanagar

1. Aravidu Dynasty of Vijayanagar—H. Heras.
2. Archaeological Survey Report, 1907-8, 1908-9, 1911-12.
3. Beginnings of Vijayanagar—H. Heras.
4. Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts in the Bombay Presidency—J. F. Fleet.
5. Elliot and Dowson, Vol. IV.
6. Ferishta—Briggs.
7. A Forgotten Empire—R. Sewell.
8. Hampi Ruins—A. H. Longhurst.
9. History of Tinnevelly—Dr. Caldwell.
10. Historical Inscriptions of Southern India—R. Sewell and S. K. Aiyangar.
11. Indian Antiquary, Nov.-Dec., 1932.
12. Indian Historical Quarterly, June, 1937.
13. Inscriptions of this period in: (i) The Epigraphia Indica; (ii) The Epigraphia Carnatica; (iii) Nellore Inscriptions by Messrs. Butterworth and Venugopal Chetti.
14. Journal of Indian History, 1927 and 1930.
15. Krishnadeva Rāya of Vijayanagar—S. K. Aiyangar.
16. Little Known Chapter of Vijayanagar History—S. K. Aiyangar.
17. Mysore and Coorg from Inscriptions—B. L. Rice.
18. Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagar Empire, Vols. I and II—B. A. Saletore.
19. Sources of Vijayanagar History—S. K. Aiyangar.
20. South India and Her Muhammadan Invaders—S. K. Aiyangar.
21. Vijayanagar—Origin of the City and Empire—N. Venkata Ramanayya.
22. Vijayanagar Sexcentenary Commemoration Volume.

Orissa, Mewār, Nepāl, Kāmarūpa

1. Annals and Antiquities of Rājasthān—Tod (Crooke's edition).
2. Dynastic History of Northern India—H. C. Ray.
3. History of Assam—E. A. Gait.
4. History of Orissa—R. D. Banerjee.
5. Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1900.
6. Mughal North-East Frontier Policy—S. N. Bhattacharya.

Chapter VI

Administration

1. Aspects of Muslim Administration—R. S. Tripathi.

2. Gunpowder Artillery in the reign of Iltutmish, in Journal of Indian History, 1936.
3. Ibn Batūtah, Vol. III.
4. Indian Historical Quarterly, June, 1935, and September, 1937.
5. Life and Conditions of the People of Hindustān (A.D. 1200–1550) in Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1935, Letters, Vol. I, No 2.—Kunwar Muhammad Ashraf.
6. Mechanical Artillery in Medieval India, in Journal of Indian History, 1936.
7. Organisation of the Central Government under the Turkish Sultāns of Delhi, in Journal of Indian History, 1935.
8. Procedure of Succession to the Sultanate of Delhi, in Journal of Indian History, 1936.
9. Travels of Marco Polo—Yule.

Social and Economic Conditions

1. Life and Conditions of the People of Hindustān (A.D. 1200–1550)—Kunwar Muhammad Ashraf.
2. A Social History of Islamic India, 1605–1748—Mohammad Yasin (Lucknow, 1958).
3. A Social History of the Muslims in Bengal (down to 1538)—Abdul Karim, East Pakistan, 1959.
4. Studies in Islamic Culture in the Indian Environment—Aziz Ahmad, O. U. P., 1964.

Culture and Art

1. Ancient and Medieval Architecture in India—E. B. Havell.
2. Archaeology and Monumental Remains of India—Carr Stephen.
3. Conversion and Re-conversion to Hinduism during Muslim Rule, in the Calcutta Review, 1934.
4. Development of Cultural Relations between Hindus and Muslims, in the Calcutta Review, 1935.
5. Early Indo-Persian Literature and Amir Khusrav, in the Calcutta Review, 1935.
6. Gaur: Its Ruins and Inscriptions—J. H. Ravenshaw.
7. History of Bengali Language and Literature—D. C. Sen.
8. History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon—V. A. Smith.
9. History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, Vols. I and II—J. Fergusson.
10. Hundred Poems of Kabīr—Tagore.
11. Indian Architecture—E. B. Havell.
12. Influence of Islam on Indian Culture—Tara Chand.

13. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1920.
14. Life and Conditions of the People of Hindustān (A.D. 1200–1550)—Kunwar Muhammad Ashraf.
15. Modern Vernacular Literature of Hindustān—Sir George Grierson.
16. Outline of the Religious Literature of India—Farquhar.
17. Promotion of Learning in India during Muhammadan Rule by Muhammadans—N. N. Law.
18. Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India and of different States.
19. Sharqi Architecture of Jaunpur—A. Fuhrer.
20. Sikh Religion—Macauliffe.
21. Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagar Empire—Saletore.
22. Textbook of Modern Indian History—Sarkar and Datta.
23. Theism in Medieval India—Carpenter.
24. Vaishṇavism and Saivaism—Bhandarkar.

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO PART II, BOOK II

Chapter I

GENERAL

1. Chronicles of the Pathān Kings of Delhi—Thomas.
2. Date and Place of Sher Shāh's Birth, in the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, 1934.
3. Date of Sher Shāh's Accession, in the Islamic Review, 1936.
4. An Empire-Builder of the Sixteenth Century—L. F. Rushbrook Williams.
5. Historical Inscriptions of Southern India—Sewell and Aiyangar.
6. History of India under Bābur and Humāyūn—Erskine.
7. Sher Shāh and His Times—K. R. Qānūngo, (new edition, 1965).

SPECIAL

1. Akbarnāmāh—Abul Fazl. English translation by H. Beveridge. Vols. I and II, with Elliot and Dowson, Vol. VI, pp. 1–102.
2. Annals and Antiquities of Rājasthān—Tod (Crooke's edition).
3. Ferishta. English Translation by Briggs.
4. History of Bengal—Stewart.
5. Khulāsat-ut-Tawārīkh—Sujan Rāi.
6. Life and Memoirs of Gulbadan Begum: Translation by Mrs. A. S. Beveridge.
7. Makhzan-i-Afghāna—Ni'matullah. Translated by B. Dorn in History of the Afghāns, 1829.
8. Memoirs of Bābur: Translation by Mrs. A. S. Beveridge.
9. Memoirs of Jahaur: Translation by Stewart.
10. Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh—'Abdul Qādir of Badāūnī, Vol. I. English translation by Ranking and Lowe.
11. Riyāz-us-salātīn—Ghulām Husain Salīm (English translation).

Chapters II–IV and Chapters VI–VIII

GENERAL

1. Akbar the Great Moghul—Smith.
2. Annals and Antiquities of Rājasthān—Tod (Crooke's edition).

3. Army of the Indian Moghuls: Its Organisation and Administration—William Irvine.
4. Cambridge History of India, Vol. IV.
5. Dārā Shukoh—K. R. Qānūngo.
6. Emperor Akbar—Von Noer.
7. Evolution of Khalsa—I. Banerjee.
8. History of Aurangzeb, Vols. I–V—Sarkār.
9. History of Indian and Eastern Architecture—James Fergusson
10. History of Jahāngīr—Beni Prasad.
11. History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon—V. A. Smith.
12. History of the Great Moghuls, Vols. I and II—Kennedy.
13. History of the Sikhs—Cunningham.
14. Indian Sculpture and Painting—E. B. Havell.
15. India at the Death of Akbar—Moreland.
16. India from Akbar to Aurangzeb—Moreland.
17. Jahāngīr—Gladwin.
18. Journal of Indian History, 1928 and 1930.
19. Main Currents of Marātha History—Sardesai.
20. Mediaeval India—Lane-Poole.
21. Modern Vernacular Literature of Hindustān—Sir George Grierson.
22. Mughul Administration—Sarkar.
23. Mughul Rule in India—Edwardes and Garret.
24. Oxford History of India—Smith.
25. Promotion of Learning in India during Muhammadan Rule—Law.
26. Rise of the Marātha Power, Vol. I—Ranade.
27. Shiva Chhatrapati—Sen.
28. Shivājī and His Times—Sarkar.
29. Shivājī the Marātha—Rawlinson.
30. Sikh Religion: Its Gurus, Sacred Writings and Authors—Macauliffe.
31. Studies in Mughul India—Sarkar.
32. Textbook of Modern Indian History—Sarkar and Datta.
33. Theism in Medieval India—Carpenter.
34. The Life of Mīr Jumla—Jagadish Narain Sarkar, Calcutta, 1951.
35. Raja Man Singh of Amber—R. N. Prasad, Calcutta, 1961.

SPECIAL—*Indian Sources*

1. Āīn-i-Akbarī—Abul Fazl. Translated by Blochmann and Jarrett and published by A.S.B.

2. Akbarnāmāh—Abul Fazl. Translated into English by Beveridge and published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
3. Muntakhab-ul-Lubāb—Khāfī Khān, published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Bibliotheca Indica Series in 1869. Portions dealing with the reigns of Aurangzeb and his successors are translated in Elliot, Vol. VII, pp. 211–533.
4. Muntakhab-ut-Tawārīkh—'Abdul Qādir Badāūnī. Translated into English by Ranking and Lowe and published by the A.S.B.
5. 'Pādshāhnāmāh'—'Abdul Hamīd Lāhorī. Published by the A.S.B. in the Bibliotheca Indica Series in two volumes and partly translated in Elliot, Vol. VII, pp. 5–72.
6. The Ta'rīkh-i-Firishta, or Firishta's History. Translated into English by Briggs under title 'History of the Rise of the Muhammadan Power in India,' in 1829. Reprinted by Cambray and Co., Calcutta, 1908.
7. The Tūzuk-i-Jahāngīrī. Translated by Rogers, edited by H. Beveridge, 2 vols. (R.A.S., London).

Contemporary Jesuit Accounts, European Travellers and Factors

1. De Laet: 'De Imperio Magni Mogolis, sive India Vera, Commentarius ex variis Auctoribus congestus' (vide Calcutta Review, October 1870, January 1871, July 1873, and Indian Antiquary, November 1914). English translation by Hoyland (Taraporevala).
2. E. D. Maclagan's article, entitled 'Jesuit Missions to the Emperor Akbar' in J.A.S.B., Part I, Vol. LXV, 1896, pp. 38–113. Also a new volume published by Burns and Oates in 1932.
3. Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe to the Court of the Great Moghul, 1615–1619, as narrated in his Journal and Correspondence. Edited by Sir William Forster and published by the Hakluyt Society.
4. Jahāngīr's India (The Remonstrantie of F. Pelsaert). Translated from the Dutch by Moreland and Geyl.
5. Monserrate: 'Mongolicae Legationis Commentarius.' Edited by Father Hosten and published in Memoirs of the A.S.B., Vol. III, No. 9, pp. 508–704, English translation by Hoyland with notes by Banerji.
6. Narrative of Fitch, who left England in 1583 and returned in 1591

7. Storia do Mogor, or Moghul India (1653–1708)—Manucci. Translated by William Irvine.
8. Travels in India—Tavernier.
9. Travels in the Moghul Empire (1656–1668)—Bernier.
10. Travels of Peter Mundy in Europe and Asia, 1608–1667. Edited by Sir R. Temple. Published by the Hakluyt Society, Vol. II.
11. Voyages—Hawkins. Purchas: His Pilgrimes, Vol. III, pp. 1–50, and Foster, Early Travels in India.
12. Voyages and Travels of John Albert de Mandelslo . . . into the East Indies. Revised and translated by John Davis. London, 1669 (vide J.R.A.S., April, 1915).
13. Voyage to East India—Terry (1616-19).

Chapter V

GENERAL

1. Fall of the Moghul Empire—Keene.
2. Fall of the Moghul Empire—Owen.
3. Fall of the Mughal Empire, Vols. I, II, & III—J. N. Sarkar.
4. First Two Nawābs of Oudh—A. L. Srivastava.
5. History of the Jats, Vol. I—K. R. Qānūngo.
6. Later Moghuls, two volumes—Irvine.
7. Muhammadan India, Bk. VI, Ch. 7—Smith.
8. Nādir Shāh—Frazer.
9. New History of the Marathas—G. S. Sardesai.
10. Rise of the Peshwās—H. N. Sinha.
11. Rise of the Sikh Power—N. K. Sinha.

SPECIAL

1. Annals and Antiquities of Rājasthān—Tod (Crooke's edn.).
2. Shāhnāmah-i-Bahādur Shāh—Dānishmand Khān. Elliot and Dowson, Vol. VII.
3. Bayān-i-Waqāi'—Khwāja 'Abdu' Karim (Kujhua Wakf Library, Saran). An English translation, wanting the first chapter and the later additions of the author, was published by Gladwin under the title of 'Memoirs of Khojeh Abdul Kerim' (Cal. 1788; a copy of this is preserved in the Imperial Library, Calcutta). A fuller translation was made by Lt. H. G. Pritchard for Sir H. M. Elliot, and is now preserved in MS. (Br. Mus., Addl. 30782).
4. History of Bengal—Stewart.
5. History of the Mahrattas—Duff.
6. History of the Sikhs—Cunningham.

7. 'Ibratnāmah—Md. Qāsim Lāhorī. Elliot and Dowson, Vol. VII.
8. India Tracts (Trans. of a Persian MS.) (Lond., 1788)—Major James Browne.
9. Khulāsat-ut-Tawārīkh—Kalyān Singh (Khudābakhsh Library, Patna).
10. Memoir of Central India—Malcolm.
11. Muntakhab-ul-Lubāb—Khāfī Khān (Bib. Ind., Calcutta 1869). Elliot and Dowson, Vol. VII.
12. Muzaffarnāmāh (Khudābakhsh Library, Patna).
13. Riyāz-us-salātīn—Ghulām Husain Salīm (English translation).
14. Siyar-ul-Mutakherin—Ghulām Husain. English translation by Hājī Mustafā: Cambray's Edition, four volumes.

PART III

MODERN INDIA

Book I

THE RISE AND GROWTH OF THE BRITISH POWER

VASCO DA GAMA
from an old print

0°
20°
40°
Vienna
Venice
Genoa
BLACK SEA
Constantinople
Trebizond
PORTUGA
Lisbon
SPAIN
Angora
Aleppo
Damascus
8.7.1497
Alexandria
Suez
Cairo
Basra
EGYPT
Jeddah
Mecca
Vasco da Gama
AFRICA
Zeila
ABYSSINIA
Mombasa
(Port.)
Malindi
St. Helena
(Port.)
Mozambique
(Port.)
MADAG
Cape of Good Hope
Tristan da Cunha
(Port.)
Meridian 0° of Greenwich
40°
20°
0°
20°
40°


80°
100°
120°
40°
20°
0°
20°
TRANS OXIANA
Kashgar
Balkh
Kabul
Kandahar
KINGDOM OF DELHI
Delhi
RAJPUTANA
SIND
GUJARAT
MALWA
JAUNPUR K.
BENGAL K.
Cambay
Hughli (Port)
Chittagong
Surat
Daman (Port.)
Diu (Port.)
Bombay
Calcutta
BAHMANI K.
Goa (Port.)
VIJAYA NAGAR K.
Madras
Pondicherry
Calicut
Cochin (Port.)
Colombo (Port.)
CEYLON
17.5.1498
CHINA
Canton
Macao (Port.)
SIAM
PHILIPPINE ISLANDS
Malacca (Port.)
SUMATRA
BORNEO
CELEBES
JAVA
AUSTRALIA
MEDIÆVAL INDIA AND THE WEST
Equatorial Scale
100 300 500 700
0 200 400 600 800
Kilometres
Ottoman Empire
Portuguese possessions
Vasco da Gama's voyage to India
Trade routes closed by Turkish & Portuguese wars
East
80°
100°
120°

CHAPTER I

ADVENT OF THE EUROPEANS

FOREIGNERS could enter India mainly through two routes—the well-known land-route across the north-west frontier and the sea-route. The Muslims from Ghaznī and Ghūr, Samarqānd and Kābul invaded this country through the land-route. The Mughul Empire took care to maintain a large standing army to buttress its authority; but it failed to realise the importance of guarding the sea-coast by building a strong navy, which, among the Indian powers of modern times, the Marāthas alone tried to do. Evidently the Mughuls did not aspire to rule the sea, across which came to India the European trading nations, who ultimately gave a new turn to the history of this land.

India had commercial relations with the countries of the West from time immemorial. But from the seventh century A.D. her sea-borne trade passed into the hands of the Arabs, who began to dominate the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea. It was from them that the enterprising merchants of Venice and Genoa purchased Indian goods. The geographical discoveries of the last quarter of the fifteenth century deeply affected the commercial relations of the different countries of the world and produced far-reaching consequences in their history. Bartholomew Diaz doubled the Cape of Good Hope, or the Stormy Cape, as he called it, in 1487; and Vasco da Gama found out a new route to India and reached the famous port of Calicut on the 17th May, 1498. "Perhaps no event during the Middle Ages had such far-reaching repercussions on the civilised world as the opening of the sea-route to India."

1. The Portuguese

The discoveries of Vasco da Gama, who received friendly treatment from the Hindu ruler of Calicut bearing the hereditary title of *Zamorin*, brought the merchants of Portugal, who had always coveted the advantages of eastern trade, into direct maritime touch with India and opened the way for their commercial relations with her. On the 9th March, 1500, Pedro Alvarez Cabral sailed

out from Lisbon to India in command of a fleet of thirteen vessels. But the Portuguese, instead of confining themselves within the limits of legitimate trade, became unduly ambitious to establish their supremacy in the eastern seas by forcibly depriving the merchants of other nations of the benefits of their commerce, and molesting them. This inevitably brought them into hostilities with the ruler of Calicut, whose prosperity was largely dependent on Arab merchants. The Portuguese on their side began to take part in the political intrigues among the States of Peninsular India and entered into alliances with the enemies of the ruler of Calicut, the chief of whom was the ruler of Cochin.

It was Alfonso de Albuquerque who laid the real foundation of Portuguese power in India. He first came to India in 1503 as the commander of a squadron, and the record of his naval activities being satisfactory, was appointed Governor of Portuguese affairs in India in 1509. In November, 1510, he captured the rich port of Goa, then belonging to the Bijāpur Sultānate, and during his rule did his best to strengthen the fortifications of the city and increase its commercial importance. With a view to securing a permanent Portuguese population, he encouraged his fellow-countrymen to marry Indian wives; but one serious drawback to his policy was his bitter persecution of the Muslims. The interests of the Portuguese were, however, faithfully served by him, and when he died in 1515 they were left as the strongest naval power in India with domination over the west coast.

A number of important Portuguese settlements were gradually established near the sea by the successors of Albuquerque. These were Diu, Damān, Salsette, Bassein, Chaul and Bombay, San Thomé near Madras and Hugli in Bengal. Their authority also extended over the major part of Ceylon. But in course of time they lost most of these places with the exception of Diu, Damān and Goa, which they retained until 1961. We have already noted how Qāsim Khān captured Hugli during the reign of Shāh Jahān, and the Marāthas captured Salsette and Bassein in A.D. 1739.

Though the earliest "intruder into the East", the Portuguese lost their influence in the sphere of Indian trade by the eighteenth century. Many of them took to robbery and piracy, though a few adopted more honourable careers. Several causes led to their decline. Firstly, their religious intolerance provoked the hostility of the Indian powers, which became too strong for them to overcome. Secondly, their clandestine practices in trade ultimately went against them. Thirdly, the discovery of Brazil drew the colonising activities of Portugal to the West. Lastly, they failed

to compete successfully with the other European Companies, who had come in their wake. These were jealous of the prosperity of Portugal due to her eastern trade and would not accept her policy of exclusion and extravagant claims, though these were based on priority of occupation and a Papal Bull.

In A.D. 1600 the English East India Company secured a royal charter granting them "the monopoly of commerce in eastern waters". The United East India Company of the Netherlands was incorporated for trading in the East by a charter granted by the Dutch States General on the 20th March, 1602, which also empowered the said Company to make war, conclude treaties, acquire territories and build fortresses. It was thus made "a great instrument of war and conquest". The Danes came in A.D. 1616. The French East India Company, sponsored by the famous French statesman Colbert and formed under State patronage in A.D. 1664, was destined to have an important career in the East. The Ostend Company, organised by the merchants of Flanders and formally chartered in A.D. 1722, had but a brief career in India. A Swedish East India Company was formed in A.D. 1731, but its trade was confined almost exclusively to China. A bitter contest among these trading companies was inevitable, as the object of their ambition was the same. Their designs of territorial expansion increased the bitterness of their commercial rivalry. There was a triangular contest during the first half of the seventeenth century—between the Portuguese and the Dutch, between the Portuguese and the English, and between the Dutch and the English. The Dutch opposition to the growth of English influence in India finally collapsed owing to the former's defeat at the battle of Bedara (Biderra) in A.D. 1759, but the Anglo-French hostility that had begun in the meanwhile continued throughout the eighteenth century.

2. The Dutch

With a view to getting direct access to the spice markets in South-East Asia, the Dutch undertook several voyages from 1596 and eventually formed the Dutch East India Company in 1602.

In 1605 the Dutch captured Amboyna from the Portuguese and gradually established their influence at the cost of the latter in the Spice Islands. They conquered Jacatra and established Batavia on its ruins in 1619, blockaded Goa in 1639, captured Malacca in 1641 and got possession of the last Portuguese settlement in Ceylon in 1658. The Dutch came to the islands of Sumatra, Java and the Moluccas, attracted by the lucrative trade in pepper

and spices, with which those islands abounded, so that "the Archipelago was not only the strategic and administrative centre of their system, it was also their economic centre"

Commercial interests drew the Dutch also to India, where they established factories in Gujarāt, on the Coromandel Coast and in Bengal, Bihār and Orissa, entering deep into the interior of the lower Ganges valley. The more important of their factories in India were at Masulipatam (1605), Pulicat (1610), Surāt (1616), Bimlipatam (1641), Karikal (1645), Chinsurā (1653), Cāssimbāzār, Barānagore, Patna, Balāsore, Negapatam (1658) and Cochin (1663). By supplanting the Portuguese, the Dutch practically maintained a monopoly of the spice trade in the East throughout the seventeenth century. They also became the carriers of trade between India and the islands of the Far East, thus reviving a very old connection maintained in the palmy days of the Vijayanagar Empire. At Surāt the Dutch were supplied with large quantities of indigo, manufactured in Central India and the Jumnā valley, and from Bengal, Bihār, Gujarāt and Coromandel they exported raw silk, textiles, saltpetre, rice and Gangetic opium. After 1690, Negapatam instead of Pulicat became the chief seat of the Dutch on the Coromandel.

The Spanish and Portuguese Crowns remained united from A.D. 1580 to 1640. England concluded peace with Spain in A.D. 1604; but the English and the Portuguese became rivals of each other in the eastern trade. By allying themselves with the Shāh of Persia, the English captured Ormuz in the Persian Gulf from the Portuguese in A.D. 1622 and obtained permission to settle in Gombroon and take half the customs dues. From this time, however, Portuguese rivalry began to be less acute. The treaty of Madrid, concluded in 1630, provided for the cessation of commercial hostilities between the English and the Portuguese in the East, and in 1634 Methold, the President of the English factory at Surāt, and the Portuguese Viceroy of Goa signed a convention, which "actually guaranteed commercial inter-relations" between the two nations in India. The growth of peaceful relations between the English and the Portuguese was facilitated by the recovery in A.D. 1640 of Portugal's independence from the control of Spain, the old enemy of England. The right of the English to the eastern trade was recognised by the Portuguese in a treaty, dated July, A.D. 1654; and another treaty, concluded in A.D. 1661, secured for the Portuguese from Charles II, who received Bombay as a part of the dowry of Catherine of Braganza, the promise of English support against the Dutch in India. In fact, the English were no longer faced with bitter commercial rivalry from the Portuguese in India,

who came to be too degenerate to pursue any consistent policy, though individual Portuguese traders occasionally obstructed the collection of investments by the English in their factories in the eighteenth century.

The Dutch rivalry with the English, during the seventeenth century, was more bitter than that of the Portuguese. The policy of the Dutch in the East was influenced by two motives: one was to take revenge on Catholic Spain, the foe of their independence, and her ally Portugal, and the other was to colonise and establish settlements in the East Indies with a view to monopolising commerce in that region. They gained their first object by the gradual decline of Portuguese influence, which we have already noted. The realisation of their second object brought them into bitter competition with the English. In Europe also the relations between England and Holland had been hostile under the Stuarts and Cromwell, owing to commercial rivalry, and the French alliance and pro-Spanish policy of the Stuarts.

The naval supremacy of the Dutch and the negotiation of a twenty-one years' truce between Spain and Holland in 1609, by freeing them from the danger of war in Europe and some restrictions in the Spice Islands, encouraged the Dutch to oppose English trade in the East Indies more vigorously than before. During this period, the activities of the Dutch were mostly confined to Java and the Archipelago. However, they established themselves on the Coromandel Coast and fortified a factory at Pulicat in 1610, to provide themselves with cotton goods for which a ready market could be found in the Archipelago. Conferences held in London and at the Hague (A.D. 1611 and 1613–1615) led to an amicable settlement between the Dutch and the English. They came to terms in A.D. 1619 but hostilities were renewed after two years, and the cruel massacre of ten Englishmen and nine Japanese at Amboyna in 1623 "marked the climax of Dutch hatred" of the English in the East. Though the Dutch began to confine themselves more to the Malay Archipelago and the English to India, the former did not cease to be commercial rivals of the latter in India. The years 1630–1658 formed a period of expansion for the Dutch on the Coromandel Coast and extension of their trade in other regions, "though wars, famine and official rapacity continued to plague them"[1] and they had occasional conflicts with Mīr Jumla. During the years 1672–1674 the Dutch frequently obstructed communications between Surāt and the new English settlement of Bombay and captured three English vessels in the Bay of Bengal.

[1] Tapan Raychaudhuri, *Jan Company in Coromandel, 1605–1690*, chapter III.

In 1698 the Dutch chief of Chinsurā complained to Prince 'Azīm-us-Shān, when he visited Burdwān, that while his company paid a duty of 3½ per cent on their trade, the English paid only Rs. 3,000 per annum, and asked that the Dutch might be granted the same privilege as the English. The commercial rivalry of the Dutch and the English remained acute till A.D. 1759.

3. The English East India Company

The completion of Drake's voyage round the world in 1580, and the victory of the English over the Spanish Armada, inspired the people of England with a spirit of daring and enterprise in different spheres of activity and encouraged some English sea-captains to undertake voyages to the eastern waters. Between 1591 and 1593 James Lancaster reached Cape Comorin and Penang; in 1596 a fleet of vessels under Benjamin Wood sailed eastwards; and in 1599 John Mildenhall, a merchant adventurer of London, came to India by the overland route and spent seven years in the East. It was on the 31st December, 1600, that the first important step towards England's commercial prosperity was taken. On that memorable day the East India Company received a charter from Queen Elizabeth granting it the monopoly of eastern trade for fifteen years. At first the Company dispatched "separate voyages", each fleet being sent by a group of subscribers, who divided among themselves the profits of their trade, and it had to encounter various difficulties. "It had to explore and map out the Indian seas and coasts, it had painfully to work out a system of commerce, to experiment with commodities and merchandise, to train and discipline a staff of servants. It had to brave or conciliate the hostility of England's hereditary Catholic enemy and her new Protestant rival. Further, it had to establish a position even at home . . . there was no active State support given to England's first essays in the East. The East India Company was cradled in the chilly but invigorating atmosphere of individualism. It had to cope with the lingering medieval prejudice against the export of bullion and a fallacious theory of foreign trade."

The early voyages of the English Company were directed to Sumatra, Java and the Moluccas in order to get a share of the spice trade. It was in 1608 that the first attempt was made to establish factories in India. The Company sent Captain Hawkins to India, and he reached the court of Jahāngīr in 1609. He was at first well received by the Mughul Emperor, who expressed his desire to permit the English to settle at Surāt, for which Hawkins

had petitioned. But the hostile activities of the Portuguese, and the opposition of the Surāt merchants, led him to refuse the English captain's petition. Hawkins left Āgra in 1611 and at Surāt met three English ships under the command of Sir Henry Middleton. Middleton adopted a policy of reprisals against the Surāt merchants with regard to their Red Sea trade, which alarmed the latter and led them to admit to Surāt two English vessels under Captain Best in 1612. The force sent by the Portuguese was defeated by Best, and early in 1613 Jahāngīr issued a *firman* permitting the English to establish a factory permanently at Surāt. Soon the English Company sent an accredited ambassador of the King of England, James I, to the Mughul court with a view to concluding a commercial treaty with the Emperor. The person chosen was Sir Thomas Roe, who was "of pregnant understanding, well spoken, learned, industrious, and of a comely personage" Roe remained constantly at Jahāngīr's court from the end of 1615 till the end of 1618, and though certain factors prevented him from concluding any definite commercial treaty with the Mughul Emperor, he succeeded in securing several privileges for the Company, particularly the permission to erect factories in certain places within the Empire. Before Roe left India in February, 1619, the English had established factories at Surāt, Āgra, Ahmadābād and Broach. All these were placed under the control of the President and Council of the Surāt factory, who had also the power to control the Company's trade with the Red Sea ports and Persia. English factories were also started at Broach and Barodā with the object of purchasing at first hand the piece-goods manufactured in the localities, and at Āgra, in order to sell broadcloth to the officers of the imperial court and to buy indigo, the best quality of which was manufactured at Biyāna. In 1668 Bombay was transferred to the East India Company by Charles II, who had got it from the Portuguese as a part of the dowry of his wife Catherine of Braganza, at an annual rental of £10. Bombay gradually grew more and more prosperous and became so important that in 1687 it superseded Surāt as the chief settlement of the English on the west coast.

On the south-eastern coast the English had established a factory at Masulipatam, the principal port of the kingdom of Golkundā, in 1611 in order to purchase the locally woven piece-goods, which they exported to Persia and Bantam. But being much troubled there by the opposition of the Dutch and the frequent demands of the local officials, they opened another factory in 1626 at Armāgāon, a few miles north of the Dutch settlement of Pulicat.

Here also they were put to various inconveniences, and so turned their attention again to Masulipatam, and to their great advantage the Sultān of Golkundā granted them the "*Golden Firman*" in A.D. 1632 by which they were allowed to trade freely in the ports belonging to the kingdom of Golkundā on payment of duties worth 500 *pagodas* a year. These terms were repeated in another *firman* of A.D. 1634. But this did not relieve the English traders from the demands of local officers and they looked for a more advantageous place. In A.D. 1639 Francis Day obtained the lease of Madras from the ruler of Chandragiri, representative of the ruined Vijayanagar Empire, and built there a fortified factory which came to be known as Fort St. George. Fort St. George soon superseded Masulipatam as headquarters of the English settlements on the Coromandel Coast.

The next stage in the growth of English influence was their expansion in the north-east. Factories had been started at Hariharpur in the Mahānadī Delta and at Balāsore in A.D. 1633. A factory was established at Hugli, under Mr. Bridgeman, in 1651, and soon others were opened at Patna and Cāssimbāzār. The principal articles of the English trade in Bengal during this period were silk, cotton piece-goods, saltpetre and sugar, but owing to the irregular private trade of the factory the Company did not derive much advantage before some time had elapsed. In 1658 all the settlements in Bengal, Bihār and Orissa, and on the Coromandel Coast, were made subordinate to Fort St. George.

For various reasons, the prospects of the Company's trade at Madras and Surāt were not very bright during the first half of the seventeenth century. But its misfortunes disappeared during the second half of that century, owing to changes in the policy of the home government. The charter granted by Cromwell in 1657 gave it fresh opportunities. The thirty years following the Restoration of 1660 formed a period of expansion and prosperity. Both Charles II and James II confirmed the old privileges of the Company and extended its powers. At the same time, the establishment of a permanent joint-stock backing greatly relieved the Company of its past financial difficulties.

The Company's policy in India also changed during this period. A peaceful trading body was transformed into a power eager to establish its own position by territorial acquisitions, largely in view of the political disorders in the country. The long warfare between the imperial forces, the Marāthas and the other Deccan states, the Marātha raids on Surāt in 1664 and 1670, the weak government of the Mughul viceroys in Bengal, which

became exposed to grave internal as well as external dangers, the disturbances caused by the Malabar pirates and the consequent necessity of defence made the change inevitable. Gerald Aungier, successor of Sir George Oxenden as President at Surāt and Governor of Bombay since 1669, wrote to the Court of Directors that "the times now require you to manage your general commerce with the sword in your hands". In the course of a few years the Directors approved of this change in the Company's policy and wrote to the Chief at Madras in December, 1687, "to establish such a politie of civil and military power, and create and secure such a large revenue to secure both . . . as may be the foundation of a large, well grounded, secure English dominion in India for all time to come". Sir Josiah Child, the dominant personality in the affairs of the Company in the time of the later Stuarts, was largely responsible for this new policy, though it did not actually originate with him. In pursuance of it, in December, 1688, Sir John Child, his brother, blockaded Bombay and the Mughul ports on the western coast, seized many Mughul vessels and sent his captain to the Red Sea and Persian Gulf "to arrest the pilgrimage traffic to Mecca". But the English had underestimated the force of the Mughul Empire, which was still very strong and could be effectively exercised. Sir John Child at last appealed for pardon to Aurangzeb, who granted it (February, 1690), and also a licence for English trade when the English agreed to restore all the captured Mughul ships and to pay one-and-a-half lacs of rupees in compensation.

In Bengal, where the staples of commerce could not be purchased near the coast but had to be procured from places lying far up the waterways of the province, the Company was subject to payment of tolls at numerous customs-posts and to vexatious demands by the local officers. In 1651 Sultān Shujā issued a *firman* granting the Company the privilege of trading in return for a fixed annual payment of duties worth Rs. 3,000. Another *nishān*, granted in 1656, laid down that "the factory of the English Company be no more troubled with demands of customs for goods imported or exported either by land or by water, nor that their goods be opened and forced from them at under-rates in any places of government by which they shall pass and repass up and down the country; but that they buy and sell freely, and without impediment". But the successors of Sultān Shujā did not consider the *nishān* to be binding on them and demanded that the English, in view of their increasing trade, should pay duties similar to the other merchants. The Company procured a *firman* from

Shāista Khān in 1672 granting them exemption from the payment of duties, and the Emperor Aurangzeb issued a *firman* in 1680 ordering that none should molest the Company's people for customs or obstruct their trade, and that "of the English nation, besides their usual custom of 2 per cent for their goods, more 1½ *jezia*, or poll-money, shall be taken". But in spite of these *firmans*, the Company's agents in all places—Bombay, Madras and Bengal—could not escape from the demands of the local customs-officers and their goods were occasionally seized.

The Company at last decided to protect themselves by force, for which they thought it necessary to have a fortified settlement at Hugli. Hostilities actually broke out between the Mughuls and the English on the sack of Hugli by the latter in October, 1686. Hijli and the Mughul fortifications at Balāsore were also stormed by the English. The English were repulsed from Hugli, and abandoning it went down the river to a fever-stricken island at the mouth of the river, whence the wise English agent, Job Charnock, opened negotiations which ended in securing permission for the English to return to Sutanutī in the autumn of 1687. But hostilities were renewed in the next year when a fresh naval force was sent from London, under Captain William Heath, with orders to seize Chittāgong. The commander, however, failed in his object and then retired to Madras.

These rash and unwise actions on the part of the English stopped when the President and Council of Bombay concluded a peace with the Mughul Emperor in 1690. Job Charnock returned to Bengal in August, 1690, and established an English factory at Sutanutī. Thus was laid "the foundation of the future capital of British India, the first step in the realisation of the half-conscious prophecy of 1687". Under the orders of the Mughul Emperor, Ibrāhīm Khān, successor of Shāista Khān in the government of Bengal, issued a *firman* in February, 1691, granting the English exemption from the payment of customs-duties in return for Rs. 3,000 a year. Owing to the rebellion of Sobhā Singh, a zamindār in the district of Burdwān, the English got an excuse to fortify their new factory in 1696, and in 1698 they were granted the *zamindārī* of the three villages of Sutanutī, Kalikātā (Kalighata = Calcutta) and Govindapur on payment of Rs. 1,200 to the previous proprietors. In 1700 the English factories in Bengal were placed under the separate control of a President and Council, established in the new fortified settlement which was henceforth named Fort William, Sir Charles Eyre being the first President of Fort William. The position of the Company in its Bengal settlement was some-

what peculiar. It held Bombay on behalf of the English Crown, no Indian prince having any jurisdiction there. At Madras its powers were based on the acquiescence of the Indian rulers and also on its English charters. "In Bengal this dual source of the Company's position was much more evident." It owed its authority over the English subjects here to English laws and charters; but over the Indian inhabitants it exercised authority as a zamindār.

The prosperity of the Company under Charles II and James II roused the jealousy of its enemies who resented its monopoly of trading privileges after the Revolution of 1688, which gave power to the Whigs. The Whigs were opposed to a body of traders who had been in alliance with the old government. They lent assistance to the interlopers, as the private traders were called. In 1694 the House of Commons passed a resolution to the effect that all the subjects of England had an equal right to trade in India unless prohibited by statute. In 1698 a Bill was passed into law establishing a new Company on the lines of a regulated Company. This new body came to be called the "General Society" and the old Company joined it as a member from 1707 in order to preserve the right of trading in India. About the same time a large number of other subscribers were incorporated into another joint-stock Company under the title of the "English Company of Merchants". In spite of financial embarrassments, the new Company became indeed a serious rival of the old one, and sent Sir William Norris as an ambassador to the court of Aurangzeb to secure trading privileges for itself. But the mission ended in failure. Under some pressure from the ministry, the two Companies resolved upon amalgamation in 1702, which came into effect under the award of the Earl of Godolphin in 1708–9. The two Companies were henceforth amalgamated under the title of "The United Company of Merchants of England Trading to the East Indies" and their internecine quarrels stopped for ever. The legal monopoly of the United Company remained untouched till A.D. 1793.

The expansion of the English East India Company's trade and influence in India during the first forty years of the eighteenth century was quiet and gradual, in spite of the political disorders of the period, which only created occasional, but not very serious, hindrances for it and were easily overcome. The most important event in the history of the Company during this period was its embassy to the Mughul court in 1715, sent with a view to securing privileges throughout Mughul India and some villages round Calcutta. It was conducted from Calcutta by John Surman, assisted by Edward Stephenson. William Hamilton accompanied

it as a surgeon and an Armenian named Khwāja Sērhud as an interpreter. Hamilton succeeded in curing the Emperor Farrukhsiyar of a painful disease, and he, being thus pleased with the English, issued *firmans* complying with their request and directed the governors of the provinces to observe them. The privilege enjoyed by the English of trading in Bengal, free of all duties, subject to the annual payment of Rs. 3,000 per annum, was confirmed; they were permitted to rent additional territory round Calcutta; their old privilege of exemption from dues throughout the province of Hyderābād was retained, they being required to pay only the existing rent for Madras; they were exempted from the payment of all customs and dues at Surāt hitherto paid by them, in return for an annual sum of Rs. 10,000; and the coins of the Company minted at Bombay were allowed to have currency throughout the Mughul dominions.

In Bengal, Murshid Qulī Jāfar Khān, a strong and able governor, opposed the grant of the additional villages to the English. Still, the other rights secured by the *firman* of 1716–17 greatly furthered their interests. It has been aptly described by Orme as the "Magna Charta of the Company". The trade of the Company in Bengal gradually prospered, in spite of the occasional demands and exactions of the local officials. The importance of Calcutta increased so that it came to have a population of 100,000 by A.D. 1735, and the Company's shipping at the port during the ten years following the embassy of 1715 amounted to ten thousand tons a year.

For about eighteen years after Farrukhsiyar's *firman*, the trade of the English Company on the western coast suffered from the quarrels between the Marāthas and the Portuguese, and the ravages of the Marātha sea-captains, notably Kānhojī Angria, who dominated the coast between Bombay and Goa from two strongholds, Gheria (or Vijayadrug) and Suvarndrug. During the government of Charles Boone from 1715 to 1722, a wall was built round Bombay and armed ships of the Company were increased in order to defend its factory and trade against hostile fleets. After these eighteen years, the Company's trade in Bombay began to increase, its military strength was developed and Bombay had a population of about 70,000 in A.D. 1744, though the Marātha sea-captains were not finally crushed before 1757. The English concluded a treaty with the Marāthas in 1739, and in alliance with the Peshwā, launched attacks against the Angrias. Suvarndrug was captured by Commodore James in 1755 and in 1757 Clive and Watson captured their capital, Gheria. At Madras also the English carried on a "peaceful commerce", being on "excellent terms" both with the Nawāb of

the Carnatic and his overlord, the Subahdār of the Deccan. In 1717 they took possession of five towns near Madras which Thomas Pitt, Governor of Madras from 1698 to 1709, had originally obtained from the Nawāb of the Carnatic in 1708, and in 1734 they also got Vepery and four other hamlets.

4. The French East India Company and French Settlements

Though "the desire for eastern traffic displayed itself at a very early period among the French", they were the last of the European powers to compete for commercial gains in the East with the other European Companies. Nevertheless leading Frenchmen like Henry IV, Richelieu and Colbert realised the importance of Eastern commerce. At the instance of Colbert, the "Compagnie des Indes Orientales" was formed in A.D. 1664. Though created and financed by the State, the French Company's first movements were "neither well considered nor fortunate", because its energies were then frittered away in fruitless attempts to colonise Madagascar, which had already been visited by Frenchmen. But in 1667 another expedition started from France under the command of François Caron, who was accompanied by Marcara, a native of Ispahān. The first French factory in India was established by François Caron at Surāt in A.D. 1668, and Marcara succeeded in establishing another French factory at Masulipatam in 1669 by obtaining a patent from the Sultān of Golkundā. In 1672 the French seized San Thomé, close to Madras, but in the next year their admiral, De la Haye, was defeated by a combined force of the Sultān of Golkundā and the Dutch and was forced to capitulate and surrender San Thomé to the Dutch. Meanwhile, in 1673 François Martin and Bellanger de Lespinay, one of the volunteers who had accompanied Admiral De la Haye, obtained a little village from the Muslim governor of Valikondāpuram. Thus the foundation of Pondicherry was laid in a modest manner. François Martin, who took charge of this settlement from A.D. 1674, developed it into an important place, through personal courage, perseverance and tact, "amid the clash of arms and the clamour of falling kingdoms". In Bengal, Nawāb Shāista Khān granted a site to the French in 1674, on which they built the famous French factory of Chandernagore in 1690–1692.

The European rivalries between the Dutch (supported by the English) and the French adversely influenced the position of the French in India. Pondicherry was captured by the Dutch in 1693 but was handed back to the French by the Treaty of Ryswick in 1697. Martin, again placed in charge of this settlement, restored its

prosperity so that it came to have a population of about 40,000 at the time of his death in 1706 as compared with the 22,000 of Calcutta in the same year. But the French lost their influence in other places, and their factories at Bantam, Surāt and Masulipatam were abandoned by the beginning of the eighteenth century. The resources of the French Company were practically exhausted by this time, and till 1720 it passed through very bad days, even selling its licences to others. Of the five governors of Pondicherry who held office from 1707 to 1720 none followed the strong and wise policy of Martin. But with the reconstitution of the Company, in June, 1720, as the "Perpetual Company of the Indies", prosperity returned to it under the wise administration of Lenoir and Dumas between 1720 and 1742. The French occupied Mauritius in 1721, Māhé on the Malabar coast in 1725, and Karikal in 1739. The objects of the French, during this period, were, however, purely commercial. There "was nothing in the conduct of Lenoir or Dumas that allows us to credit the Company with political views and still less ideas of conquest; its factories were more or less fortified, but for motives of simple security against the Dutch and the English; and although it enlisted troops, it used them only for purposes of defence". After 1742 political motives began to overshadow the desire for commercial gain and Dupleix began to cherish the ambition of a French Empire in India, which being challenged by the English opened a new chapter in Indian history.

CHAPTER II

RISE OF THE BRITISH POWER, 1740–1765

1. The English and the French : The First Carnatic War

For nearly twenty years the Carnatic—the name given by the Europeans to the Coromandel Coast and its hinterland—became the scene of a long-drawn contest between the French and the English, which led to the ultimate overthrow of the French power in India. It had its repercussions also in Bengal which produced unexpected and momentous results. In the light of later events, we may justly regard this struggle as having decided once for all that the English and not the French were to become masters of India. For these reasons the Carnatic war has attained a celebrity in history which is not fully justified either by the immediate issues involved or by the incidents of the war itself.

In order to understand fully the nature of the struggle, we have to keep in view not only the position of the English and French Companies in India and the relations of the two nations in Europe, but also the prevailing political conditions in the Deccan and the somewhat uncertain relationship subsisting between the English and French merchants on the one hand and the local Indian powers on the other. All these important factors shaped the course of events as they developed from a petty struggle for privileges of trade into a bold bid for the empire of the Mughuls.

As has already been noted, Madras and Pondicherry were the chief trading stations of the English and the French on the Coromandel Coast. Each of these was a fortified city with about 500 Europeans and 25,000 Indians. The English also possessed in addition the Fort of St. David, a little to the south of Pondicherry. All three cities were situated on the sea-coast and depended for their safety and fresh supplies of resources from home upon the command of the sea. This aspect was not indeed fully realised at first, but its importance was gradually revealed. It put both the English and the French on a vantage-ground in respect of the local authorities, who had no navy, and ultimately made the success of the struggle between the two European

Companies dependent upon the power of each to maintain command over the sea.

Not only did the local Indian authorities possess no navy, but their condition was such that they shortly ceased to count as important military powers even on land. Politically, the whole of the Carnatic was almost in the melting-pot. It formed a province under the Subahdār of the Deccan, and was ruled by a governor, called the Nawāb, with headquarters at Arcot. But as Nizām-ul-mulk, the Subahdār of the Deccan, had made himself independent to all intents and purposes, the Nawāb of Arcot, in his turn, behaved almost like an independent prince. The Nizām, his nominal suzerain, was so engrossed with the Marāthas and the affairs of Northern India that he could hardly exercise any effective authority in the affairs of the Carnatic, except when, on rare occasions, he could spare some time and energy to visit the southern province.

One such occasion arose in the beginning of 1743. Three years earlier the Marāthas had plundered the Carnatic, killed its governor, Nawāb Ḍost 'Ālī, and taken his son-in-law, Chanda Sāḥib, as prisoner to Sātārā. Safdar 'Ālī, the son of Dost 'Ālī, had saved his life and kingdom by promising to pay the Marāthas a crore of rupees, but he was soon murdered by a cousin, and his young son was proclaimed Nawāb. All these incidents created a feeling of panic and uncertainty in the Carnatic and induced the Nizām to come there in person to restore order. It was, however, beyond his power to settle affairs in that troubled region, and although he appointed Anwār-ud-dīn Khān, a tried servant, Nawāb of the Carnatic, things drifted on almost as hopelessly as in previous years. The appointment of the new Nawāb made things worse as he was sure to be regarded as an intruder and rival by Nawāb Dost 'Ālī's relatives, who still held many forts and enjoyed extensive *āgīrs*.

While the whole of the Carnatic was being convulsed by these political events, the English and the French settlements were carrying on their peaceful avocations of trade and commerce, without any effective hindrance from any of the combatants. The French and the English had not as yet begun to take any active part in Indian politics except when it directly affected the interests of their trade. Nor did the local authorities regard them as of sufficient importance to be seriously taken notice of. Thus, left to themselves, they might have gone on pursuing their normal activities unaffected by what was going on around them.

But this was not to be. In 1740 England was involved in a European war known as the War of the Austrian Succession (1740–

1748). It is not necessary to discuss here either the origin or the progress of that war, but it will suffice to state that England and France took opposite sides and fought in the Netherlands for a period of nearly eight years.

The outbreak of war between England and France also placed the two mercantile Companies in India technically in a state of war. But the French authorities, both in Europe and India, at first tried hard to maintain neutrality in this country. There was precedent for such a state of things, and Dupleix, the governor of Pondicherry, opened direct negotiations with the English authorities in India for this purpose. But as the authorities in England declined to accept the proposal, their representatives in India, although willing to avoid hostilities, were unable to guarantee any neutrality, especially in seas where they had no control over His Majesty's ships.

As a matter of fact, hostilities were opened by the capture of French ships by the English navy under Barnett. As the French had no fleet in Indian waters, Dupleix sent an urgent appeal to La Bourdonnais, the governor of Mauritius, to come to his rescue. After a great deal of difficulty the latter equipped a squadron and reached the Indian seas with eight ships of the line.

The arrival of La Bourdonnais changed the course of the war. The commander of the English ships was either unwilling or unable to engage in a serious contest with the French and sailed to Hugli leaving the whole Madras coast at the mercy of the French squadron.

The French now besieged Madras both by land and sea. Within a week Madras surrendered, after a loss of only six killed. The English had so far displayed an amazing incapacity to fight the French on land or sea, and fortune seemed to smile upon the efforts of Dupleix.

But the greatest surprise of the war was yet in store. Anwār-ud-dīn, the newly appointed Nawāb of the Carnatic, was not a silent spectator of the contest that was raging within his kingdom. As the ruler of the country he was at least a nominal protector of both the English and the French, and each of them openly recognised this position in times of need. Thus, when at the outbreak of hostilities the English were all-powerful at sea, Dupleix had appealed to the Nawāb to protect the French ships. The English, however, did not respect his authority and paid no heed to his protests and complaints. But when Madras was besieged by the French, the English in their turn sought the protection of the Nawāb. Anwār-ud-dīn, true to his role of protector, asked Dupleix to raise the siege of Madras, but the French were no more disposed

than the English to respect his authority when it suited their purpose not to do so. There was, however, one vital difference. The Nawāb was unable to interfere actively in naval affairs as he possessed no navy. It was quite different in the case of warfare on land, as here the Nawāb was willing and seemed able to back up his demand by force. Dupleix knew this and sought to pacify him by diplomacy. He told the Nawāb that he was taking Madras only to place it in his hands. The Nawāb was, however, too astute to believe this, and when his repeated warnings went unheeded he sent an army against the French force besieging Madras.

Had the English in Madras resisted a little longer, the French would have been caught between two fires. As it was, the army of the Nawāb found the French in possession of the city, and blockaded them. But the tiny French force made a sally and scattered the unwieldy host of the Nawāb. The Nawāb's army was forced to retire to St. Thomé and was again defeated by a detachment of the French army which was coming to reinforce the French in Madras.

The defeat of the Nawāb's troops had far-reaching consequences which will be discussed in the proper place. For the time being the success of the French seemed complete and their material gains and increase in prestige seemed to exceed their highest ambitions.

But the overwhelming success brought in its train discord and disunion. La Bourdonnais had promised to restore Madras for a suitable ransom, but Dupleix was strongly against this policy. After a prolonged quarrel, Dupleix seemed ready to submit, when a hurricane caused severe damage to the French fleet and forced La Bourdonnais to retire with his ships from the Indian seas. Dupleix now formally denounced the treaty which La Bourdonnais had made with the Council of Madras and plundered Madras "from top to bottom".

But the success of his policy was dearly purchased. With the departure of La Bourdonnais the English obtained the command of the sea. The first effect of this change was the failure of Dupleix to take Fort St. David in spite of a prolonged siege of eighteen months. In June, 1748, a large squadron was sent out from England under Rear-Admiral Boscawen to avenge the capture of Madras, and now the English in their turn besieged Pondicherry, both by land and sea. Fortune again smiled on Dupleix. Pondicherry was saved by the lack of military skill of the besieging army, and in October Boscawen was forced to raise the siege on the approach of the monsoon. Before he could renew the siege the War of the Austrian Succession had been concluded by the Treaty of Aix-la-

Chapelle (1748). Under the terms of the Treaty, Madras was restored to the English, and Boscawen sailed back to Europe. Thus closed the first stage of the struggle without any territorial gain on either side.

2. The Second Carnatic War

Outwardly the two parties were left by the Treaty exactly where they were before, but events soon proved that the situation had really changed a great deal. The recent struggle had some obvious lessons which the quick mind of Dupleix did not fail to grasp. They formed the basis of a new and daring policy which in its ultimate effects changed the whole course of Indian history.

The war had illustrated the great importance of sea-power. It demonstrated beyond doubt that, situated as they were, neither the French nor the English could hope to obtain a decisive and permanent success unless they could control the sea. The recognised supremacy of the English in this respect offered, therefore, but a gloomy prospect to the French. Besides, the French power was practically limited to the Carnatic, whereas the English had important settlements both in Bombay and Bengal. In any struggle for supremacy the French would therefore be at a great disadvantage, as regards both supplies from home and command of resources in India itself. The chances of ultimate success of the French against the English appeared thus to be very small indeed.

Any other person would have been dismayed by these sombre prospects. But the genius of Dupleix shone forth and suggested to him the only way out of the difficulty. The episode of Anwār-ud-dīn's discomfiture before Madras made a deep impression upon his mind and suggested immense possibilities in a new direction. The utter rout of Anwār-ud-dīn's huge forces by the small French army on land proved that in warfare better discipline and up-to-date equipment counted far more than mere numbers; and that vast Asiatic armies were no longer a match for even a handful of European troops. In his small but brave and disciplined army he thus possessed an effective weapon which would prove a decisive factor in any quarrel between two Indian princes. And in those days of political unrest, Indian princes would not be wanting who would be prepared to offer any price to Dupleix for turning the scale in their favour. Backed by the prestige and resources of such an Indian authority the French would ultimately be more than a match for the English.

So argued Dupleix, and as the events showed, reasonably enough. Fortune favoured him, and placed before him a unique

opportunity to work out his new policy. We have already referred to the fact that the appointment of Anwār-ud-dīn Khān as the Nawāb of the Carnatic gave rise to discontent among the friends and relations of the late Nawāb Dost 'Ālī. This was brought to a head by Chanda Sāhib, the son-in-law of Dost 'Ālī, who had been taken prisoner by the Marāthas in 1741 as related above, but was set free after seven years. He now conspired to get back the throne of his father-in-law. A similar contest was then going on for the throne of the Deccan. Asaf Jāh Nizām-ul-mulk, who founded the kingdom, died in A.D. 1748, and was succeeded by his son, Nāsir Jang, but his grandson, Muzaffar Jang, laid claim to the throne on the ground that the Mughul emperor had appointed him Subahdār of the Deccan.

Dupleix was eagerly waiting for a situation like this. He concluded a secret treaty with Chanda Sāhib and Muzaffar Jang with a view to placing them on the thrones of the Carnatic and the Deccan respectively. On the 3rd of August, 1749, the three allies defeated and killed Anwār-ud-dīn at the battle of Ambur, to the south-east of Vellore. Muhammad 'Ālī, the son of Anwār-ud-dīn, fled to Trichinopoly and a French army was sent to reduce that town.

The English could not fail to realise the great danger which threatened them, but they lacked the energy of Dupleix. They sent urgent invitations to Nāsir Jang to come and crush his enemies in the Carnatic and sent some help to Muhammad 'Ālī at Trichinopoly But they could not organise an effective confederacy against the one headed by Dupleix. The result was that Nāsir Jang, in spite of some initial successes in the Carnatic, was ultimately killed (December, 1750). Muzaffar Jang, who had been kept a prisoner, was now set free and proclaimed Subahdār of the Deccan. The grateful Subahdār suitably rewarded the services of his French ally. He appointed Dupleix governor of all the Mughul territories south of the Kṛishṇā river and ceded to him territories near Pondicherry as well as on the Orissa coast, including the famous market-town of Masulipatam. In return, at the request of Muzaffar Jang, Dupleix placed at his disposal the service of his best officer, Bussy, with a French army. It proved to be the surest means to guarantee French influence at the court of the Nizām.

So far, things had gone admirably for the French, and Dupleix's policy triumphed beyond his most sanguine expectations. His protégés, Muzaffar Jang and Chanda Sāhib, occupied the thrones at Hyderābād and Arcot. In less than two years an insignificant body

of foreign merchants was raised to the position of supreme political authority in the Deccan and the Carnatic. To friends and foes alike Dupleix's success appeared nothing short of a miracle.

In order to complete his success it was necessary for Dupleix to come to a settlement with Muhammad 'Ālī, who had taken refuge at the strong fort of Trichinopoly. The French force sent to reduce that city had wasted its energy in a fruitless effort to reduce Tanjore. Dupleix, therefore, decided to try the effect of diplomacy. He would perhaps have succeeded but for the intervention of the English, whose help and encouragement stiffened the resistance of Muhammad 'Ālī.

It was now clear, even to the most obtuse mind, that the British position in Madras would be irrevocably lost if Dupleix were left free to complete his designs. Fortunately for the English their new governor, Saunders, who took over charge in September, 1750, was more energetic than his predecessor. Under his guidance the English threw their whole weight into the struggle, and the home authorities, realising the gravity of the situation, determined to back him up with all the resources at their disposal. Thus although there was then no regular declaration of war or even avowed hostility between the English and the French nations in Europe, they engaged in an open war in India, nominally as auxiliaries of the native powers, but really as the principals in a life-and-death struggle.

Had Dupleix been able to strike a decisive blow at Muhammad 'Ālī before the English could come to his rescue he might have nullified altogether the belated efforts of his rivals. But he was out-manœuvred by the clever diplomacy of his opponents. On the advice of the English, Muhammad 'Ālī kept up the negotiations opened by Dupleix, simply to gain time till the English were in a position to send effective assistance to him. Dupleix did not realise that he was being duped, till in May, 1751, a British detachment actually set out towards Trichinopoly. He then sent a French army under Law to capture the place, but Law proved hopelessly incompetent for the task. The siege of Trichinopoly dragged on, and by the end of the year the rulers of Mysore and Tanjore and the Marātha chief, Morārī Rāo, joined Muhammad 'Ālī and the English.

In the meantime events were marching rapidly in the north. Robert Clive, a civilian employee in Madras, had lately joined the army. He proposed an expedition against Arcot, which had been already suggested by Muhammad 'Ālī and approved of by the English governor, Saunders, as the best means of preventing the

fall of Trichinopoly, for Chanda Sāhib was sure to divert an effective part of his army to the protection of his capital. The proposal was accepted and Clive was entrusted with its execution. With only two hundred Europeans and three hundred sepoys he occupied Arcot without any serious opposition. As he foresaw, Chanda Sāhib immediately sent a relieving force from Trichinopoly to recapture his capital. For fifty-three days Clive heroically defended the city till the besieging forces withdrew (Sept.–Oct. 1751).

The capture of Arcot was the most remarkable achievement of the war. This daring exploit at once enhanced the reputation of the English as a fighting power and gave a crushing blow to the prestige of the French. Law, the French general in charge of the siege of Trichinopoly, was unnerved by the success of Clive and took refuge on the island of Śrīrangam. At the instance of Robert Clive the English besieged the island. Dupleix sent reinforcements, but they surrendered to the English on June 9, 1752. Three days later Law and his troops became prisoners of the English. To complete the disaster of the French, Chanda Sāhib surrendered and was beheaded by the Tanjorean general.

Dupleix's high hopes were now dashed to the ground. By the incredible folly and incompetence of his generals he had lost the prize which was almost within his grasp. Still he worked on undaunted by recent reverses. He won over Morārī Rāo and the ruler of Mysore to his side and secured the neutrality of the Rājā of Tanjore. He then began active operations (31st December, 1752) and renewed the siege of Trichinopoly. Minor military engagements took place throughout 1753 with alternate success and failure on both sides. Up to the very end Dupleix did not give up hope of taking Trichinopoly.

But the French authorities at home were thoroughly tired of Dupleix and decided to recall him. They never understood the full implications of the masterly policy of their gifted governor and were greatly concerned at the discomfiture of the French troops and the heavy financial losses which his policy involved. Accordingly they sent Godeheu to investigate the local conditions and take proper measures to retrieve the situation. Godeheu landed on 1st August, 1754, superseded Dupleix, and reversed his policy. He opened negotiations with the English and concluded a treaty. The English and the French both agreed not to interfere in the quarrels of the native princes and each party was left in possession of the territories which it actually occupied at the time of the treaty.

Thus the French lost almost everything that Dupleix had gained for them. In the Deccan alone Dupleix's policy still bore some

ruit. By dint of extraordinary ability and energy, Bussy still maintained his influence there against the almost universal opposition of the nobility, who disliked the French and wanted to drive them out of the Deccan. Often Bussy thought of retiring to the Carnatic but was prevented by Dupleix, who steadily pursued the policy of maintaining an effective control at headquarters. By a masterly stroke of policy Bussy induced the Nizām to grant him the Northern Sarkārs for the payment of his troops. These consisted of the four districts of Mustafānagar, Ellore, Rājāhmundry and Chicacole, yielding an annual revenue of more than thirty lacs of rupees. But even this solid acquisition did not enable Bussy to render any substantial assistance to the French in the Carnatic in the most critical hours.

The subsequent history of the French in the Deccan and the Carnatic will be dealt with in due course. But before we leave the subject we may consider the causes which led to the failure of Dupleix. It is obviously beyond the scope of this work to discuss at length the different views held on this subject, both by contemporaries and later historians. Passions and prejudices have clouded the issues and an insufficient knowledge of the relevant material makes it impossible to arrive at any definite conclusion. We must, therefore, confine ourselves to a broad general review of the whole situation without descending into details.

It is agreed on all hands that the immediate and the main cause of Dupleix's discomfiture was the failure of the home authorities to appreciate the merit of his plans and to support their execution by sending adequate assistance. It is, however, suggested that Dupleix alone was responsible for this, inasmuch as ne never cared to take his superiors into his confidence or divulge his plans to them in all details until it was too late. But if this is true, it only reveals the inherent conviction of Dupleix, justified in a large measure by later events, that the Government of France were either unwilling or unable to devote serious attention to Indian issues and were always apt to view them as minor and subsidiary parts of their general policy. For while in England there was a private body, like the East India Company, whose whole interest was bound up with that of the English factories in India, the French trading concern was directly controlled by the Government, whose policy was naturally dictated by larger political issues. As a matter of fact, one of the chief reasons which induced them to settle amicably with the English in India was the fear of complications in America.

In the second place, it has been suggested that Dupleix attempted

too much, and the division of his forces in the Deccan and the Carnatic was the real cause of his failure. It is hard to accept this view as even substantially correct. In the first part of 1754 Dupleix had enough military strength at his disposal to force the issue to a final decision. Even after the English had advanced to the help of Muhammad 'Ālī, there was no reasonable apprehension that the French could be either outnumbered or out-manœuvred by the English.

On a careful consideration of all the relevant facts, the failure of Dupleix seems to be due to two main causes. He failed to recognise that the game in which he was engaged was one at which two could play, that the English could imitate his own policy in retrieving their lost position. Had he recognised this, he would certainly have come to a final reckoning with Muhammad 'Ālī, one way or the other, before the English were ready to send any effective help to him.

Secondly, the hopeless incompetence of the French generals prevented him from rectifying his initial mistake. It is idle to deny the fact that the subsequent course of events in the Carnatic was determined to a large extent by personalities rather than circumstances. The brilliant genius and bold dash of Clive on the one hand, and the indecision and lack of energy displayed by Law and his colleagues on the other, determined the issues. Had Dupleix had at his disposal a military genius of the type of Clive, the history of the French in India might have been altogether different. If Dupleix could have triumphantly ended the war either at the beginning or even at the end of 1751, the French Government would have hailed him as the founder of their Empire in India and sent abundant supplies to him in men and money. His failure to do this involved him in disgrace and obloquy. He was engaged in one of those risky undertakings where success elevates a man to the rank of a hero but failure denounces him as an obstinate and perverse adventurer.

3. English Success in Bengal

The peace between the English and the French continued undisturbed till the outbreak of the Seven Years' War in Europe, news of which reached India towards the end of 1756. As in the case of the War of the Austrian Succession, England and France took opposite sides in this European war, forcing the English and the French in India to engage in hostilities which neither of them probably desired.

During the interval between the two wars, the relative positions of the English and the French had changed considerably, first by the struggle in the Carnatic which we have described above, and secondly by the events in Bengal to which we now turn.

Like the Deccan, Bengal was under a Subahdār who nominally acknowledged the suzerainty of the Mughul Emperor of Delhi, but was to all intents and purposes an independent king. Like the Deccan, too, Bengal lacked any political strength or stability. Conspiracies and revolutions were the order of the day and corruption and inefficiency sapped the vitality of the State.

'Ālīvardī Khān, the Nawāb of Bengal, who owed his accession to the throne in 1740 to a successful revolution against his master, Nawāb Sarfarāz Khān, proved a strong and capable ruler. But almost his whole regime was spent in an unceasing warfare with the Marātha plunderers, whose repeated incursions caused untold miseries to the people of Bengal. At last he had to buy peace by the cession of the revenues of a part of Orissa and an annual payment of twelve lacs of rupees as *Chauth* to them (May or June, 1751). During the remaining five years of his reign he tried to restore order and set up a regular system of government, but failed (p. 532).

The failure was due partly to the ill-health of the Nawāb, but mainly to the uncertainty of succession after his death. 'Ālīvardī had no male heir. His three daughters were married to three sons of his brother. Sirāj-ud-daulah, the son of his youngest daughter, was his chosen successor, but the arrangement was naturally disliked by the two other sons-in-law, who were governors respectively of Dacca and Purnea. It was inevitable that they should be centres of plots and conspiracies by scheming persons. Although both of them died towards the close of 'Ālīvardī's reign, Ghasiti Begam, the widow of the former, and Shaukat Jang, the son of the latter, pursued their policy up to the very end. Ghasiti was ably supported by her *Diwān* Rājballabh, who really carried on affairs in the name of the princess.

Amidst these troubles 'Ālīvardī died on 9th April, 1756, and Sirāj-ud-daulah ascended the throne without any difficulty. But although his succession was unopposed, his troubles indeed were great. In addition to the hostile activities of Rājballabh and Shaukat Jang, he found himself implicated in a bitter dispute with the English Company.

Even when Sirāj-ud-daulah was administering the State during the illness of 'Ālīvardī, the relations between the Nawāb and the English had been anything but friendly. The main cause of the dispute was the additional fortification of Calcutta, which the

English had recently undertaken, ostensibly as a measure of precaution against the French. The recent events in the Carnatic were certainly calculated to rouse the suspicion of the Nawāb against any such measure. The manner in which it was done increased the wrath of the Nawāb still further. The English not only mounted guns on the old fort but also commenced to build additional fortifications without the permission or even the knowledge of the Nawāb. The fact was that the English discounted, like many others, the chances of Sirāj-ud-daulah's accession to the throne, and were therefore eager to court the favour of Rājballabh, the leader of the opposing party, with surer chances of success. This explains why at the request of Watts, their agent at Cāssimbāzār, the English agreed to give protection to Rājballabh's son Kṛishṇadās, who fled to Calcutta with his family and treasure. They knew full well that this step was calculated to provoke the wrath of Sirāj-ud-daulah against them. There is no doubt also that Sirāj-ud-daulah construed the event as proving the complicity of the English in the schemes of Rājballabh against him.

The contemporary historian, Orme, writes: "There remained no hopes of Alivardy's recovery; upon which the widow of Nawajis (i.e. Ghasiti Begam) had quitted Muxadabad (the capital city of Murshidābād) and encamped with 10,000 men at Moota Ghill (Moti jhil), a garden two miles south of the city, and many now began to think and to say that she would prevail in her opposition against Surajo Dowla (Sirāj-ud-daulah). Mr. Watts therefore was easily induced to oblige her minister and advised the Presidency (of Calcutta) to comply with his request."

Indeed, the rumour was widely spread in Murshidābād that the English had espoused the cause of Ghasiti Begam. Dr. Forth, attached to the factory of Cāssimbāzār, visited 'Ālīvardī about a fortnight before his death. While he was talking with the Nawāb, Sirāj-ud-daulah came in and reported that he had information to the effect that the English had agreed to help Ghasiti Begam. The dying Nawāb immediately questioned Forth about this. Forth not only denied the charge but disavowed on behalf of his nation any intention to interfere in Indian politics.

This denial had but little effect on the mind of Sirāj-ud-daulah which was already embittered against the English over the question of fortification. Immediately after his accession to the throne, he communicated his views to Watts, the chief of the English factory at Cāssimbāzār, in remarkably plain language. The Nawāb pointed out that he looked upon the English only as a set of merchants

and they were welcome as such, but he disapproved of their recent fortifications and insisted on their immediate demolition. The Nawāb also sent envoys to Calcutta with similar instructions and a demand for the surrender of Rājballabh's family, but they were dismissed with scant respect by the English governor. This incredible conduct can only be explained by a tenacious belief that Rājballabh would ultimately succeed against Sirāj-ud-daulah.

The first concern of Sirāj-ud-daulah after his accession to the throne was, therefore, to remove the great internal danger that threatened his safety. By a masterly stroke, which has not been sufficiently recognised in history, he succeeded in quietly removing Ghasiti Begam to his own palace, without any bloodshed. The English now came to realise their mistake. Excuses and apologies were offered for their late conduct. But Sirāj-ud-daulah was not the man to be satisfied by mere hollow promises. He wrote a letter to Mr. Drake, the governor of Calcutta, repeating his orders to demolish the additional fortifications. For the time being he could do no more, for although Ghasiti Begam had been suppressed, Shaukat Jang, the governor of Purnea, still remained the centre of a revolutionary conspiracy against him. The Nawāb rightly concluded that he must remove this danger before he could adopt a strong policy towards the English. Accordingly he marched towards Purnea. When he reached Rājmahal, the reply of Governor Drake reached him. It was couched in polite language, but contained no indication that he would comply with the Nawāb's request. The Nawāb immediately changed his mind, and returned to Murshidābād, in order to begin a campaign against the English in good earnest. The letter of Drake evidently convinced him that he had more to fear from the inveterate enmity of the British than anything that Shaukat Jang could do against him.

Once having taken the decision, Sirāj-ud-daulah acted with unwonted energy. The return journey from Rājmahal commenced on 20th May. He reached Murshidābād on 1st June and on 4th June seized the English factory at Cāssimbāzār. On 5th June he marched against Calcutta and reached there on the 16th. Three days later, Governor Drake, the Commandant and many prominent Englishmen abandoned the fort to its fate and sought their own safety on board the ships. Next day, i.e. on 20th June, Fort William surrendered to Sirāj-ud-daulah after a feeble resistance.

The capture of Calcutta will ever remain memorable in history on account of the so-called Black Hole episode, which occupies a prominent place in the narrative of Holwell. According to his version, 146 English prisoners were confined during the night in

a small room, known as the Black Hole, 18 feet long by 14 feet 10 inches wide. One hundred and twenty-three died of suffocation, and 23 miserable survivors alone remained to tell the tale of that tragic summer night.

The truth of this story has been doubted on good grounds. That some prisoners were put into the Black Hole and a number of them, including those wounded in the course of the fight, died there, may be accepted as true. But the tragic details, designed to suit a magnified number of prisoners, must almost certainly be ascribed to the fertile imagination of Holwell, on whose authority the story primarily rests. In any case, it is agreed on all hands that Sirāj-ud-daulah was not in any way personally responsible for the incident.

Leaving his general Mānikchānd in charge of Calcutta, Sirāj-ud-daulah returned to Murshidābād. Shaukat Jang had in the meantime procured from the titular Mughul Emperor of Delhi the formal *Sanad* for the Subahdārship of Bengal and made no secret of his intention to make a bold bid for the viceregal throne. He no doubt relied upon the help of disaffected chiefs of Bengal like the banker Jagat Seth and the general Mīr Jāfar. But before they could agree upon any general plan, Sirāj-ud-daulah marched against Shaukat Jang and defeated and killed him.

It reflects no small credit upon the young and inexperienced Nawāb that he could get rid of his three powerful enemies within a few months of his accession to the throne. A superficial observer might well have regarded the future with equanimity, and perhaps even the Nawāb was led into a false sense of security. But if he had been a true statesman he should not have been unaware of the dangers and difficulties ahead.

It was, for instance, sheer ineptitude to expect that the English would retire from Bengal after their first defeat without making fresh efforts to retrieve their situation. For, although small in number, the possession of the sea gave them a decided advantage in any warfare with the Nawāb as it kept open the way for retreat when pressed hard, and the means of securing fresh supplies of resources, either from home or from other settlements in India. If the Nawāb had fully realised this fact he would have continued his hold upon Calcutta in order to keep the English permanently in check.

The Nawāb would perhaps have devoted his serious attention to this problem and evolved suitable measures if his own house were in order. But that was the chief plague-spot. Bengal, like most other provincial States, lacked almost every element that makes a State strong and stable. It had only recently emerged as a semi-independent kingdom; and no tradition or attachment bound

the people to the ruling house. The theoretical powers of the Emperor of Delhi still existed, and the case of Shaukat Jang showed what practical use could be made of them. The common people were too accustomed to revolutions to trouble themselves seriously about any change in the government, while the more influential chiefs shaped their policy with a view to their own interests alone. The idea of nationality or patriotism was virtually unknown. Personal allegiance to the ruler, which was the main foundation of government in those days, was conspicuously lacking in the case of Sirāj-ud-daulah. Although we may not credit all the stories of his severity and self-indulgence, which were mostly invented by his enemies, we cannot but regard him as a wayward, pleasure-loving and erratic young man, a typical product of the age in which he lived. To prove this we need only recall a few incidents of his life such as his deliberate defiance of 'Ālīvardī, when merely a boy of fifteen, his drinking bouts in Moti jhil, and the murder of Husain Qulī Khān in a public street in broad daylight. However we might condone them, they were not certainly calculated to inspire either love or confidence in the young Nawāb.

Had Sirāj-ud-daulah belonged to a royal family of long standing and ruled over a kingdom which had enjoyed for years a settled form of government, even his faults might not have proved his ruin. As it was, the circumstances of the times as well as his youth and inexperience tempted disaffection and conspiracy which neither his character nor his personality helped to allay.

The discomfited English leaders knew the situation in Bengal well enough, and, having experienced the force of the Nawāb's arms, they sought to retrieve their position by exploiting the internal situation. After the fall of Calcutta, they had taken refuge in Fulta, and from this place they carried on intrigues with the leading persons whom they knew to be hostile to the Nawāb. The attempt of Shaukat Jang to seize the throne opened up new hopes to them. They sent him a letter with presents "hoping he might defeat Sirāj-ud-daulah". When that hope failed they won over to their cause Mānikchānd, the officer in charge of Calcutta, Omichānd, a rich merchant of the city, Jagat Seth, the famous banker, and other leading men of the Nawāb's court. At the same time they made appeals to the Nawāb to restore their old privileges of trade in Calcutta. This appeal, backed by the support of the interested advisers, induced the Nawāb to consent to an accommodation with the English.

In the meantime warlike preparations were being made by the Madras Council. As soon as they received the news of the

capture of Calcutta, they decided upon sending a large military expedition. Fortunately, a fully equipped army and navy which had been made ready for an expedition against the French were immediately available. After some discussion it was resolved to send the expedition under Clive and Admiral Watson. The expedition set sail on 16th October and reached Bengal on 14th December. The Nawāb was evidently quite ignorant of this. While the English fugitives at Fulta were lulling his suspicions by piteous appeals, and his treacherous officers and advisers were pleading the cause of the "harmless traders", Clive and Watson arrived at Fulta with the force from Madras. It is only fair to note that the English at Fulta were perhaps equally ignorant of the help sent from Madras, and did their very best to induce Clive to desist from warlike operations against the Nawāb, who was ready to concede their reasonable demands. But Clive and Watson paid no heed to the proposals of their compatriots in Fulta. On 17th December Watson addressed a letter to the Nawāb asking him not only to restore the ancient "rights and immunities" of the Company but also to give them a reasonable compensation for the losses and injuries they had suffered. The Nawāb appears to have sent a pacific reply, but it probably never reached Watson. Clive marched towards Calcutta. Mānikchānd made a pretence of war and then fled to Murshidābād. Clive recovered Calcutta on 2nd January, 1757, without any serious fighting. The English then plundered Hugli and destroyed many magnificent houses in that city.

Even after these provocations, Sirāj-ud-daulah came to Calcutta and concluded the Treaty of 'Ālīnagar (9th February, 1757), conceding to the English practically all their demands. This pacific attitude of Sirāj-ud-daulah, offering such a strange contrast to his earlier policy, is difficult to explain. It has been suggested that a night attack on his camp by Clive terrified him into a humble submission. But that attack, according to Orme, was a great failure for which Clive was taken to task even by his own soldiers. Besides, the letters written by Sirāj-ud-daulah, even before he reached Calcutta, contained proposals of peace similar to those to which he afterwards agreed. It is probable that the known treacherous designs of his own officers and the apprehension of an invasion from the north-west induced him to settle with the English at any cost.

Whatever may be the right explanation, it is quite clear that from this time onward Sirāj-ud-daulah displayed a lack of energy and decision at almost every step. The outbreak of the Seven Years' War introduced a new element into the situation. The English

naturally desired to conquer the French possession of Chandernagore. Sirāj-ud-daulah very reasonably argued that he could never allow one section of his subjects to be molested by another. When the English made preparations for sending an expedition to Chandernagore he accused them of violating the Treaty of 'Ālīnagar and loudly proclaimed his determination never to sacrifice the French. Yet he did nothing to protect the French and Chandernagore was easily conquered by Clive and Watson in March, 1757. It is admitted by the English themselves that the Nawāb had a large force near Chandernagore under Nanda Kumār, the Faujdrā of Hugli, and if he had not moved away they could not have conquered the French city. It is almost certain that Nanda Kumār was bribed, but it does not appear that the Nawāb had given any definite orders to Nanda Kumār to resist the English.

The Nawāb, gallantly enough, afforded shelter to the French fugitives at his court, and refused to drive them away even when the English offered in exchange military help against a threatened invasion of Bengal by the heir-apparent to the Mughul Empire. Generosity and prudence alike must have dictated the course of policy which the Nawāb pursued, for in any war with the English the French support would have been of inestimable value to him.

The English fully understood the danger of the situation. While the war was going on with the French, a Nawāb of Bengal with sympathy for the French cause was an element of potential danger. A French force from Pondicherry might join the Nawāb and renew in more favourable circumstances the policy of expelling the English which Dupleix had so brilliantly initiated in the Carnatic.

Hence the English leaders were bent upon replacing Sirāj-ud-daulah by a Nawāb more amenable to their control. A conspiracy was set on foot with the help of the disaffected chiefs, and it was ultimately resolved to place Mīr Jāfar upon the throne of Bengal. Mīr Jāfar and Rāi Durlabh, the two generals of the Nawāb, as well as Jagat Seth, the rich banker, all joined in the plot. A regular treaty was drawn up (10th June) which stipulated, among other things, the reward to be given to the Company and to their chief servants in Calcutta for their military help. A difficulty arose at the last moment. Omichānd, who acted as the intermediary, asked for a large share of the plunder, and Clive silenced him by a forged copy of the treaty in which Omichānd's demands were admitted. As Watson refused to sign this treaty his signature was forged at the instance of Clive.

The Nawāb displayed a lamentable lack of decision and energy in this critical moment. After having drawn upon himself the

wrath and inveterate hostility of the English by his support to the French fugitives, he ultimately agreed to send them away on the advice of his treacherous ministers. At the time of their departure the French gave him friendly warning of the conspiracy, which was evidently patent to everybody save the Nawāb. His eyes were not opened until he came to know of the secret treaty. Even then he failed to act vigorously. Had the Nawāb promptly imprisoned Mīr Jāfar, the other conspirators would have been struck with terror and the plot might perhaps have come to nothing. The Nawāb's courage, however, failed. Far from taking any energetic measures, he himself paid a visit to Mīr Jāfar (15th June) and made pathetic appeals to him in the name of 'Ālīvardī Khān. Mīr Jāfar gave him most solemn assurances of support and the Nawāb was apparently satisfied. He hastily began to make preparations for the war, with Mīr Jāfar as commander of his forces.

Three days before this interview the English forces had left Calcutta on their expedition against the Nawāb. So thoroughly did treachery pervade all ranks of the Nawāb's army, that little or no real opposition was offered to the English even by the garrisons at Hugli or Kātwah. On the night of 22nd June Clive reached the mango grove of Plassey, on the bank of the Bhāgīrathī, where the Nawāb was already entrenched with his troops.

The battle broke out on the morning of the 23rd June. On the Nawāb's side Mīr Jāfar and Rāi Durlabh stood still with their large armies, and only a small force under Mohanlāl and Mīr Madan, backed by a French officer, took part in the battle. Had Mīr Jāfar loyally fought for the Nawāb the English forces might have easily been routed. Even the small advance party made the situation too critical for the English. After half an hour's fighting Clive withdrew his forces behind the trees. At eleven o'clock he consulted his officers. It was resolved to maintain the cannonade during the day and to attack the Nawāb's camp at midnight. Unfortunately a stray shot killed Mīr Madan and this so unnerved the Nawāb that he sent for Mīr Jāfar and accepted his treacherous advice to recall the only troops which were fighting for him. What followed may be best described in the words of a contemporary historian, Ghulām Husain, the author of the *Siyar-ul-mutakherin* :—

> "By this time Mohanlāl, who had advanced with Mīr Madan, was closely engaged with the enemy; his cannon was served with effect; and his infantry having availed themselves of some covers and other grounds, were pouring a quantity of bullets


BATTLE OF PLASSEY
GAINED BY
COLONEL CLIVE
JUNE 23RD, 1757
Mangora
Mutpour
Sonurdingah
River
Batcherah
Beedopara
Part of the Nabob's Entrenched Camp.
Cossimbuzar
Ramnagur
Meer Murden
Roy Dulloob
Kirlah
Plassey Grove
Bogrulty or
Meer Jaffer
Barcoree
Plassey
0
500
1000
Miles
A. Position of the British Army at 9 in the Morning.
B. Four guns advanced to check the fire of the French Party at the tank D.
C. The Nabob's Army.
D. A Tank from whence the French Party cannonaded till 3 in the Afternoon, when part of the British Army took Post there, and the Enemy retired within their Entrenched Camp.
E & F. A Redoubt and mound taken by Assault at ¼ past 4, and which completed the Victory.
G. The Nabob's Hunting House. The dotted line BE shows the encroachment of the River since the Battle.

From V. A. Smith: *The Oxford History of India* (Clarendon Press).

in the enemy's ranks. It was at this moment he received the order of falling back, and of retreating. He answered: 'That this was not a time to retreat; that the action was so far advanced, that whatever might happen, would happen now; and that should he turn his head, to march back to camp, his people would disperse, and perhaps abandon themselves to an open flight.' Sirāj-ud-daulah, on this answer, turned towards Mīr Jāfar, and the latter coldly answered: 'That the advice he had proposed was the best in his power; and that as to the rest, His Highness was the master of taking his own resolutions.' Sirāj-ud-daulah, intimidated by the General's coldness, and overcome by his own fears and apprehensions, renounced his own natural sense, and submitted to Mīr Jāfar's pleasure; he sent repeated orders, with pressing messages, to Mohanlāl; who at last obeyed, and retreated from the post to which he had advanced.

"This retreat of Mohanlāl's made a full impression on his troops. The sight of their General's retreat damped their courage; and having at the same time spied some parties which were flying (for they were of the complot), they disbanded likewise, and fled, every one taking example from his neighbour; and as the flight now had lost all its shame, whole bodies fled although no one pursued; and in a little time the camp remained totally empty. Sirāj-ud-daulah, informed of the desertion of his troops, was amazed; and fearing not only the English he had in his front, but chiefly the domestic enemies he had about his person, he lost all firmness of mind. Confounded by that general abandonment, he joined the runaways himself; and after marching the whole night, he the next day at about eight in the morning arrived at his palace in the city."

Sirāj-ud-daulah reached Murshidābād on the morning of the 24th. The news of his defeat created the utmost panic and confusion in the city. He made an effort to collect his forces, but both men and officers fled pell-mell in all directions. In vain did he lavish considerable treasures to induce the troops to stand by him, and then, finding no other way, he fled with his wife Lutf-un-nisā and one trusted servant.

Mīr Jāfar reached Murshidābād on the 25th and Clive followed him a few days later. Mīr Jāfar was proclaimed Subahdār of Bengal. In a few days news arrived of the capture of Sirāj-ud-daulah. He was brought back to the capital and immediately murdered by the orders of Mīran, the son of Mīr Jāfar. Thus the treacherous

conspiracy of Mīr Jāfar was brought to a triumphant conclusion. Clive and his colleagues secured large rewards for themselves in addition to the *zamindārī* of the Twenty-four Paraganās and a large sum for the Company.

The battle of Plassey was hardly more than a mere skirmish, but its result was more important than that of many of the greatest battles of the world. It paved the way for the British conquest of Bengal and eventually of the whole of India. Consequently everything in connection with it has been magnified beyond all proportions. Petty follies of Clive have been exaggerated almost as much as his valour and heroism. The forged document in favour of Omichānd is no doubt a stain on his character, but considering the circumstances in which he was placed, and the moral standards of the age in which he lived, these things should be looked at in the proper perspective. On the other hand, he can lay no special claim to either extraordinary military skill or statesmanship. He was opposed to the rupture with the French, which was the immediate cause of the war with Sirāj-ud-daulah, and was only forced unwillingly to this step by the obstinacy of Watson. Even when war broke out he was always hesitating. In the war-council held at Kātwah, only two days before the battle of Plassey, he gave his vote in favour of retreat. At Plassey itself he took Major Kilpatrick to task for ordering the troops to advance. Thus it would be hardly any exaggeration to say that Clive won the battle of Plassey in spite of himself. But all this does not take away from Clive the undoubted gifts of leadership and a spirit of dash and enterprise which he possessed in an unusual degree.

Clive's opponent, Sirāj-ud-daulah, has been regarded by some as a martyr and by others as a monster of iniquity. There is as little justification for the one as for the other view. He was not much worse than most rulers of his age, and certainly better than Mīr Jāfar, Nawāzish Muhammad or Shaukat Jang. In the first few months of his reign he showed undoubted ability and vigour, but lack of energy and decision was the prime cause of his ruin. There is also hardly any doubt that the conspiracy that cost him his life and throne was at least partially due to his personality and character.

Lastly, the conspiracy of Mīr Jāfar and others has been regarded as the "Great Betrayal" of the country by her unpatriotic sons. It was, however, nothing of the kind. Such conspiracies were far from being unusual in those days, and 'Ālīvardī Khān himself owed to them his accession to the throne. It would be quite wrong to regard Sirāj-ud-daulah as fighting for the country and Mīr Jāfar and others as betraying it. Both sides acted from pure

self-interest and do not appear to have given a thought to the country as a whole. As a matter of fact, nobody perhaps thought, or had any reasonable grounds for thinking, that the conspiracy set on foot by Mīr Jāfar and his colleagues would make the British the rulers of Bengal. Even as it was, the battle of Plassey gave Clive no better prospect in this respect than that of Bussy in the Deccan. That things took a different turn in Bengal was largely due to the character of Mīr Jāfar and the nobles of his court, and also to the political circumstances of Bengal. But in some measure, at least, it was due to that unknown and unknowable factor called fate or destiny which sometimes plays no inconsiderable part in the affairs of man.

4. The Third Carnatic War

The peace which was established in the Carnatic by the treaty of Godeheu was again broken by the Seven Years' War. As in the case of the First Carnatic War, a war in Europe forced the English and the French in India to engage in hostilities which none perhaps desired at that moment. The news of the outbreak of the war reached India in November, 1756, and one of its immediate effects was the capture of Chandernagore—a French possession in Bengal —by Clive and Watson as described above.

In Madras, however, neither the English nor the French possessed enough military resources to commence hostilities at once. The major part of the military and naval forces of Madras had been sent under Clive and Watson to recover Calcutta. Even after that object was achieved, Clive delayed his return to Madras, on account of his ambitious political schemes which ultimately led to the battle of Plassey. The French resources were similarly crippled as the governor of Pondicherry had to send assistance to Bussy at Hyderābād.

So it was not until A.D. 1758 that warlike operations began on a large scale. The English fleet returned from Bengal under the command of Pocock who had succeeded Watson after the latter's death in A.D. 1757. The French received reinforcements from home and Count de Lally was sent to conduct the war. He was invested with absolute power in all civil and military affairs but he had no control over the naval forces which were commanded by d'Ache. This division of command, leading to disunion and discord, hampered the progress of the French and, as we shall see, ultimately ruined their cause.

Lally began splendidly. He besieged Fort St. David on 1st May and the place capitulated on 2nd June. He now wisely decided

to strike at the root of the British power in the Carnatic by reducing Madras. But d'Ache, who had already been defeated by the English fleet on the 28th April, refused to sail. It was impossible to carry on operations against Madras without the help of the navy, and so Lally decided to relieve his financial difficulties by forcing the Rājā of Tanjore to pay 70 lacs of rupees which he owed to the French. He invested Tanjore (18th July) but could not press the siege owing to lack of ammunition. The fact was that there was no spirit of mutual trust and concord between Lally and his men. He irritated them by his rude and haughty conduct and consequently he was ill-served by them. Lally, no doubt, possessed a high degree of military skill, but he was too hasty and ill-tempered to co-ordinate the different parts of the war machine. He wasted much time before Tanjore without being able to do anything. In the meantime, the English fleet had engaged d'Ache's squadron and inflicted heavy losses upon it (3rd August). As soon as Lally received this news, he raised the siege of Tanjore (10th August), thereby inflicting a heavy blow not only to his own reputation but also to the prestige of the French army.

The French fleet now left the Indian seas and Lally had to wait till the English fleet would be forced to leave the harbourless Madras coast on the approach of the monsoon. He utilised the interval by making conquests of minor English outposts till the English possessed nothing in the Carnatic save Madras, Trichinopoly and Chingleput. Then when the English ships left he besieged Madras on 14th December. But the siege of Madras was marked by defects of the same kind as were noticed in the case of Tanjore. It dragged on till 16th February, 1759, when the British fleet reappeared, and Lally immediately raised the siege. This ignoble failure practically sealed the fate of the French in India.

The next twelve months completed the debacle. Lally had taken a very unwise step in recalling Bussy from Hyderābād and leaving the French troops there under incompetent commanders. Clive took this opportunity to send an army from Bengal under Colonel Forde against the French troops in the Northern Sarkārs. Forde defeated the French, successively occupied Rājāhmundry (7th December) and Masulipatam (6th March) and concluded a favourable treaty with the Nizām Salābat Jang.

In the Carnatic also the English took the aggressive. They were at first defeated near Conjeeveram, but the French could not follow up their success on account of discontent among their troops for lack of pay, which ultimately led to an open mutiny. The discomfiture of the English was, however, more than made up by the

severe defeat inflicted by Pocock upon the French fleet of d'Ache which had reappeared in September. After this third defeat at the hands of Pocock, d'Ache left India for good, leaving the English the undisputed masters of the sea.

At the end of October, the able General Coote arrived in Madras with his troops and the English resumed the offensive. After a number of minor engagements a decisive battle took place (22nd January, 1760) near the fort of Wandīwāsh which Lally was besieging. The French army was totally routed and their fate was decided once for all.

Coote followed up his success by reducing the minor French possessions in the Carnatic. In course of three months the French lost everything in the Carnatic save Jinjī and Pondicherry. The English then laid siege to Pondicherry (May, 1760).

Reduced to the last desperate strait, Lally hoped to retrieve the French position by an alliance with Hyder 'Alī, then at the helm of affairs in Mysore. The idea was well conceived but led to no practical result. Hyder sent a contingent to the aid of the French, but the allies were not able to concert any military plan which held out a chance of success against the English. Thereupon Hyder's contingent returned to Mysore, leaving Lally to his fate.

Pondicherry was closely blockaded both by land and sea. Lally lacked sufficient funds to maintain his army, and, even at this critical moment, failed to work in harmony with his men and officers. At last the inevitable took place, and on 16th January, 1761, Pondicherry made an unconditional surrender. The victors ruthlessly destroyed not merely the fortifications, but also the city itself. As Orme put it so pithily, "in a few months more not a roof was left standing in this once fair and flourishing city".

The surrender of Pondicherry was followed shortly by that of Jinjī and Mahé, a French settlement on the Malabar coast. The French thus lost all their possessions in India, but these were restored to them by the Treaty of Paris (1763).

The causes of the failure of Lally are not far to seek and some of them have been discussed in connection with the failure of Dupleix. Both suffered equally from the insufficient supply from home, which was due partly to the defective organisation of the Company as a minor branch of the Government, and partly to the failure of the home authorities to recognise the importance of securing political power in India. The inferiority of the French at sea and the discord between commanders of land and sea forces were again common handicaps to both, though they operated more decisively against the French in the Third Carnatic War.

In addition, the possession of the military and financial resources of Bengal gave the English a decisive advantage over Lally. From this secure base they could send a constant supply of men and money to Madras, and create a diversion in its favour by attacking the French in the Northern Sarkārs. Although it was not fully recognised at the time, the position of the English in Bengal made the struggle of the French a hopeless one from the very beginning of the Third Carnatic War. The battle of Plassey may be truly said to have decided the fate of the French in India.

The character and conduct of Lally also contributed not a little to the disastrous results. He had military skill and displayed bravery and energy but possessed neither the tact of a leader nor the wisdom of a statesmen. His end was tragic indeed. He was detained in England as a prisoner of war for two years, and allowed to return to France in 1763 at the end of the Seven Years' War. But a worse fate awaited him there. He was imprisoned in the Bastille for more than two years and afterwards executed with ignominy and insult.

In spite of Lally's undoubted failings and shortcomings, it is only fair to remember that the difficulties confronting him were really insurmountable, and that the French had no real chance of success against the English even under the best of leaders. There is a large element of truth in the remark of a historian, that "neither Alexander the Great nor Napoleon could have won the empire of India by starting from Pondicherry as a base and contending with the power which held Bengal and command of the sea".

5. British Ascendancy in Bengal

The revolution of 1757 definitely established the military supremacy of the English in Bengal. Their hated rivals, the French, were ousted, and they obtained a grant of territories for the maintenance of a properly equipped military force. More valuable still was the prestige they had gained by the decided victory over the unwieldy hosts of the Nawāb.

As regards the government of the country, there was no apparent change. The sovereignty of the English over Calcutta was recognised, and they secured the right of keeping a Resident at the Nawāb's court. Save for these minor changes, the position of Mīr Jāfar differed, in theory, but little from that of Sirāj-ud-daulah. In practice, however, the supreme control of affairs had passed into the hands of Clive, as the new Nawāb was entirely dependent upon his support for maintaining his newly acquired position.

The position of Clive in Bengal was anomalous in the extreme. He was merely a servant of the Governor and Council of Madras when he gained the victory at Plassey. But in June, 1758, the Calcutta Council, on their own initiative, elected him to the governorship of Bengal, a position which was legalised by the orders of the Company towards the end of that year.

The anomaly of Clive's position with regard to the Nawāb, however, still continued. Without any formal rights or prerogatives, he exercised an effective control over the actions of Mīr Jāfar, and, in particular, he prevented the latter from ruining some notable Hindu officials such as Rāi Durlabh, the *Diwān*, and Rām Nārāyan, the governor of Bihār. Mīr Jāfar chafed at the interference of Clive, but he could hardly dispense with the military help of the English. This was strikingly illustrated when, in 1759, 'Ālī Gauhar (later known as Shāh 'Ālam II) planned to occupy Bengal and Bihār and laid siege to Patna. Mīr Jāfar succeeded in averting this danger with the help of Clive, but the episode was a rude reminder to him, if any such were necessary, that however unwelcome the English might be, their help was essential to keep himself on the throne.

Finally, Mīr Jāfar tried the desperate expedient of changing one master for another and entered into a conspiracy with the Dutch at Chinsurā. The Dutch were very eager to supplant the English influence by their own and made an attempt to import fresh military forces from their settlements in Java. But the vigilance of Clive thwarted their design. They were defeated and humbled at Bedārā in November, 1759, and sued for peace.

Clive thus maintained the supremacy of the English in Bengal for nearly three years, mainly by his personality and character. His departure on 25th February, 1760, was followed shortly by the death of Mīran, the son of the Nawāb, and the question of succession immediately came to the forefront. The treachery and incompetence of the Nawāb and his failure to make the payments due to the Company made him and his family distasteful to the English. Holwell, the acting Governor, suggested the bold step of taking over the administration of the country, but the other members of the Council did not approve of the plan. He then supported the cause of Mīr Kāsīm, the son-in-law of the Nawāb, and Vansittart, the permanent Governor, acquiesced in this view. A secret treaty was accordingly concluded with Mīr Kāsīm on 27th September, 1760. Mīr Kāsīm agreed to pay off the outstanding dues to the Company and also to cede the three districts of Burdwān, Midnāpur and Chittāgong. In return for these concessions the English offered

to appoint him Deputy Subahdār and guaranteed his succession to the throne.

Vansittart and Caillaud, the commander of the Company's troops, thereupon proceeded to Murshidābād. But Mīr Jāfar refused to appoint Mīr Kāsīm as Deputy Subahdār. After a fruitless discussion for five days, Caillaud was ordered to occupy the Nawāb's palace. The helpless Nawāb decided to abdicate rather than yield to the demands of the English. Mīr Kāsīm was then declared Nawāb and the revolution of A.D. 1760 was effected without any bloodshed.

It is somewhat singular that neither the English nor the new Nawāb took advantage of the new agreement to clear up the relations between the two parties. It was gradually becoming clear that, while the Nawāb claimed to be an independent ruler, the English authorities in Bengal had been acting in a manner which was incompatible with that position. It was evident that sooner or later the matter must come to a head, and the crisis came much earlier than was expected.

Vansittart followed throughout the policy of strengthening the hands of the Nawāb. While Clive protected Rām Nārāyan, the deputy governor of Bihār, Vansittart handed him over to Mīr Kāsīm who first robbed him and then put him to death. Having thus asserted his internal autonomy, Mīr Kāsīm felt strong enough to enter into that dispute with the English regarding inland trade which was to prove his ruin.

By an imperial *firman* the English Company enjoyed the right of trading in Bengal without the payment of transit dues or tolls. But the servants of the Company also claimed the same privilege for their private trade (see pp. 801–2). The Nawābs had always protested against this abuse, but the members of the Council being materially interested, the practice went on increasing till it formed a subject of serious dispute between Mīr Kāsīm and the English. At last towards the end of 1762 Vansittart met Mīr Kāsīm at Monghyr, where the Nawāb had removed his capital, and concluded a definite agreement on the subject. The Council at Calcutta, however, rejected the agreement. Thereupon the Nawāb decided to abolish the duties altogether; but the English clamoured against this and insisted upon having preferential treatment as against other traders. Ellis, the chief of the English factory at Patna, violently asserted what he considered to be the rights and privileges of the English, and even made an attempt to seize the city of Patna. The attempt failed and his garrison was destroyed, but the events led to the outbreak of war between the English and Mīr Kāsīm (1763).

On 10th June Major Adams took the field against Mīr Kāsim with about 1,100 Europeans and 4,000 sepoys. The Nawāb assembled an army 15,000 strong, which included soldiers trained and disciplined on the European model. In spite of this disparity of numbers, the English gained successive victories at Kātwah, Murshidābād, Giriā, Sooty, Udaynalā and Monghyr. Mīr Kāsim fled to Patna, and after having killed all the English prisoners and a number of his prominent officials, went to Oudh. There he formed a confederacy with Nawāb Shujā-ud-daulah and the Emperor Shāh 'Ālam II with a view to recovering Bengal from the English. The confederate army was, however, defeated by the English general Major Hector Munro at Buxār on 22nd October, 1764. Shāh 'Ālam immediately joined the English camp, and some time later concluded peace with the English. Mīr Kāsim fled, and led a wandering life till he died in obscurity, near Delhi, in A.D. 1777.

The short but decisive campaign against Mīr Kāsim has an importance which is generally overlooked. The battle of Plassey was decided more by treachery than by any inherent superiority of English arms, and had the rights of the English in Bengal rested on that battle alone, their conquest of Bengal might justly have been attributed to a political conspiracy rather than to any fair fight. But the defeat of Mīr Kāsim cannot be explained away by any sudden and unexpected treachery such as had overwhelmed Sirāj-ud-daulah. It was a straight fight between two rival claimants for supremacy, each of whom was fully alive to its possibilities and forewarned of its consequences. Mīr Kāsim knew quite well that a final contest with the English was the sure outcome of his policy, and he equipped his army and husbanded his resources as best he could. He was not inferior in capacity to an average Indian ruler of the day. His repeated and decisive defeats only demonstrate the inherent weakness of the army and the administrative machinery of Bengal. The confederacy which he brought into being against the English shows an astute diplomacy far in advance of the age, and its failure was again due to the inherent defects of Indian army and State organisation. The engagements with Mīr Kāsim established the claims of the English as conquerors of Bengal in a much more real sense than did the battle of Plassey. They also reveal that the establishment of British rule in Bengal was due as much at least to the irresistible logic of facts as to the element of chance or accident.

It is, of course, quite true that the battle of Plassey gave the English a firm footing on the soil of Bengal, which they utilised to the full in their final encounter with Mīr Kāsim. But even

making full allowance for this, we must hold that in the final and decisive campaign the advantages, both political and military, should undoubtedly have been on the side of the Nawāb, and his ignominious failure only betrays the inherent and vital defects in the political fabric of Bengal. The question was no longer whether but when that fabric would collapse.

6. The British as the Ruling Power in Bengal

Immediately after the outbreak of war with Mīr Kāsīm, the English once more proclaimed Mīr Jāfar as the Nawāb and gained important concessions from him. His death, early in 1765, was taken advantage of by the Company to proceed still further and establish their supremacy on a definite basis. The son of Mīr Jāfar, Najm-ud-daulah, was allowed to succeed his father only on the express condition, laid down by the treaty of 20th February, 1765, that the entire management of administration should be left in the hands of a minister, called the Deputy Subahdār, who would be nominated by the English and could not be dismissed without their consent. Thus the supreme control over the administration passed into the hands of the English, while the Nawāb remained merely as a figurehead.

This was the position of affairs when Clive came out as Governor of Bengal for the second time (May, 1765). Several important and intricate problems immediately confronted him. He first made a settlement with the Emperor Shāh 'Ālam II and the Nawāb of Oudh, who had espoused the cause of Mīr Kāsīm and been defeated at Buxār. The prevailing idea among the Company's servants in Bengal was to restore the power of the Emperor so that the English could take full advantage of his name and position in advancing their interests. In pursuance of this policy, Vansittart had already promised Oudh to the Emperor. But Clive definitely gave up this policy and concluded the Treaty of Allahābād. By this he restored Oudh to its Nawāb on payment of fifty lacs of rupees. Only Allahābād and the surrounding tracts were detached from Oudh and handed over to the Emperor Shāh 'Ālam II. In return for these concessions, the Emperor, by a *firman*, formally granted the *Diwānī* of Bengal, Bihār and Orissa to the East India Company on the 12th August, 1765.

The wisdom of the policy of Clive is now generally recognised. Instead of committing the Company to endless wars, which would have been the inevitable result of supporting the pretensions of Shāh 'Ālam II, he created the buffer-state of Oudh, whose ruler

would be induced alike by material interests and sentiments of gratitude to remain friendly to the British. At the same time he gained a legal recognition of the status of the English in Bengal, which counted for much even in those days of anarchy and confusion.

Clive next made an attempt to set his own house in order. The servants of the Company were thoroughly demoralised, and bribery and corruption reigned supreme. The accession of each Nawāb, even when there was a normal succession as in the case of Najm-ud-daulah, was made the occasion of receiving large presents, and the private right of internal trade was abused in all



THE DIWĀNĪ OF BENGAL BEING GRANTED TO CLIVE

possible ways. Clive effectively stopped the system of accepting presents, in spite of strenuous opposition. He also checked the abuses of private trade, but reorganised the salt-trade with a view to distributing its profits among the civil and military servants of the Company. The Directors, however, disapproved of it and the monopoly of the salt-trade was entirely abandoned.

Clive also cut down the allowances (*bāttā*), which the military officers had been illegally enjoying for many years. Here, again, Clive met with vigorous opposition and the officers threatened to resign in a body. But the opposition gradually died down and Clive regulated the *bāttā* or field-allowances by a definite scheme.

Clive left India for good in February, 1767. In less than two years he had reformed the internal administration of the Company's affairs and placed its relation to the Government of Bengal on a definite legal basis. By his victory at Plassey, and subsequent reforms, he laid the foundations of the British supremacy in Bengal. Distinguished alike in war and peace, his name occupies a prominent place in the galaxy of British generals and administrators who carved out a mighty Empire for their motherland. His tact, patience, industry and foresight were of a high order and he always worked with a steady and clear grasp of the ends in view. In him we find a happy combination of high idealism and sound practical common sense.

Clive was succeeded by Verelst and the latter by Cartier (1769), during whose weak administration the evils of Clive's dual Government (in which the English enjoyed the substance and the Nawāb the shadow of power) were fully manifest and the country began to groan under the weight of oppression, corruption and distress, which were aggravated by the terrible famine of 1770. Richard Becher, a servant of the Company, wrote to the Secret Committee of the Court of Directors on the 24th May, 1769: "It must give pain to an Englishman to have reason to think that since the accession of the Company to the Diwānī the condition of the people of this country has been worse than it was before; yet I am afraid the fact is undoubted. . . . This fine country, which flourished under the most despotic and arbitrary government, is verging towards ruin." Nothing of particular importance marks this period. With the next governor, Warren Hastings (1772), however, we enter into a new phase of history which will be described in other chapters.

CHAPTER III

GROWTH OF THE BRITISH POWER, 1765–1798

1. Anglo-Marātha Relations

A. The First Anglo-Marātha War

AFTER recovering from the blow of Pānīpat, the Marāthas appeared in full force in the north in A.D. 1770 and brought the helpless Delhi Emperor, Shāh 'Ālam II, under their control by agreeing to escort him to his capital in return for certain privileges. Warren Hastings concluded the Treaty of Benares in September, 1773, partly to check the revived pretensions of the Marāthas in the north. But in the meanwhile a terrible calamity had befallen the Marāthas. The young Peshwā Mādhava Rāo I had expired in A.D. 1772, and internal dissensions appeared among the Marāthas, due to the inordinate ambition of the deceased Peshwā's uncle, Raghunāth Rāo or Raghoba, and the weakness of Mādhava Rāo's brother and successor, Nārāyan Rāo. Mādhava Rāo I had been able to check the designs of his uncle and even to conciliate him. But his successor, an inexperienced youth of frivolous habits, could not remain on good terms with him and placed him under arrest. This led Raghoba to organise a conspiracy with a discontented body of infantry, and Nārāyan Rāo was murdered before the eyes of his uncle on the 30th August, 1773.

Raghunāth Rāo was now recognised as the Peshwā, but his authority remained unchallenged only for a few months. A strong party at Poona, under the leadership of a young Brāhmaṇa, Nānā Fadnavis, who had luckily escaped from the fatal field of Pānīpat, began to counteract his measures. A new card was placed in the hands of the confederate Marātha leaders, when in the next year a posthumous son was born to the late Peshwā's wife, Gangā Bāī. They at once recognised the infant as the Peshwā and set up a council of regency in his name. Foiled in his attempts and driven out of the home provinces, Raghunāth Rāo appealed for help to the English at Bombay. Thus, as in the Carnatic and elsewhere in India, internal quarrels among Indian princes and chiefs offered an opportunity to the English to intervene in their affairs.

The English at Bombay were then on peaceful terms with the Marātha government at Poona, but they were induced to espouse the cause of Raghunāth Rāo by the prospect of acquiring certain maritime territories adjoining Bombay, which they calculated would make their position much more secure. In response to Raghunāth Rāo's appeal to them, they concluded with him the Treaty of Surāt on the 7th March, 1775. By this the English agreed to help Raghunāth Rāo with a force of 2,500 men, the cost of which was to be borne by him; in return Raghunāth Rāo undertook to cede to the English Salsette and Bassein with a part of the revenues of the Broach and Surāt districts, and promised not to form any alliance with the enemies of the Company and to include the English in any peace that he concluded with the Poona government. A body of British troops under Colonel Keating had already reached Surāt on the 27th February, 1775. The allied armies of Colonel Keating and Raghunāth Rāo met the Poona troops on the 18th May on the plain of Arras, situated between the river Mahi and the town of Anand, and defeated them.

But the war had been commenced, and the Treaty of Surāt signed, by the Bombay Government, without any orders from the Supreme Council in Calcutta. Warren Hastings himself had no objection to ratifying the Treaty of Surāt, but his opponents, who formed the majority in the Council, were opposed to his view. The Calcutta Council, therefore, soon condemned the action of the Bombay Council as "impolitic, dangerous, unauthorised, and unjust", and wrote to it on the 31st May to recall the Company's troops "unless their safety may be endangered by an instant retreat". A few months later in the same year, it sent Colonel Upton to Poona to negotiate a peace with the Poona regency. Colonel Upton accordingly concluded the Treaty of Purandhar with the Poona authorities on the 1st March, A.D. 1776. By this the Treaty of Surāt was annulled; the retention of Salsette, and the revenues of Broach, by the English was confirmed; the Poona regency agreed to pay twelve lacs of rupees to the English to cover the expenses of their campaign; and the English renounced the cause of Raghoba, who was to live at Kopargāon in Gujarāt on a monthly pension of Rs. 25,000 from the Peshwā's Government.

This treaty did not take effect. The Bombay Government did not like its terms and they gave shelter to Raghoba in direct violation of the treaty and despite the protests of Upton. The Poona leaders also did not fulfil its terms, and in 1777 Nānā Fadnavis received warmly a French adventurer, Chevalier de St. Lubin, and promised to grant the French a port in Western India, which created

suspicions in the minds of the members of the Bombay Council about the designs of the French in South India. The Court of Directors in several despatches upheld the policy and action of the Bombay Government, which re-opened the war and sent a force, consisting of 600 Europeans and 3,300 sepoys, under Colonel Egerton towards Poona in November, 1778. Owing to ill-health Egerton made over the command to Colonel Cockburn in January, 1779. On the 9th January the British troops met a large Marātha army at Telegāon in the Western Ghāts, but soon suffered reverses, which compelled them to sign a humiliating convention at Wadgāon. By it all territories acquired by the Bombay Government since 1773 were to be surrendered, the force arriving from Bengal was to be withdrawn and the Sindhia was to receive a share of the revenues of Broach.

This disgraceful convention was repudiated by the Governor-General, who wrote: "We have already disavowed the convention of Wadgaon. Would to God we could as easily efface the infamy which our national character has sustained." Freed from the obnoxious opposition of his colleagues, Hastings now adopted measures to retrieve the prestige of the Company. A strong army, sent from Bengal under Colonel Goddard, marched right across Central India and took possession of Ahmadābād on the 15th February and captured Bassein on the 11th December, 1780. They met with a reverse in April, 1781, however, while attempting to advance towards Poona and had to fall back. But in the meanwhile, Captain Popham, who had been sent from Bengal by Hastings to support the Rānā of Gohad, an old enemy of the Sindhia, had captured Gwālior by escalade on the 3rd August. General Camac also inflicted a defeat on the Sindhia at Sipri (modern Sivpur) on the 16th February, 1781.

The effect of these victories was to increase the prestige of the English. Mahādājī Sindhia, who had been long aiming at the leadership of the Marātha confederacy and wanted a free hand in Northern India, now changed his attitude and sought to ally himself with the English. He therefore opened negotiations with them and promised, on the 13th October, 1781, that he would effect a treaty between the English and the Poona Government. The Treaty of Salbai was duly signed on the 17th May, 1782, though it was not ratified by Nānā Fadnavis till the 26th February, 1783. By this treaty the English were confirmed in the possession of Salsette, and they recognised Mādhava Rāo Nārāyan as the rightful Peshwā; Raghoba was pensioned off; Sindhia got back all the territories west of the Jumnā; and Hyder

'Ālī, who was not a party to the treaty, had to give up the territories which he had conquered from the Nawāb of Arcot. Thus the treaty established the *status quo ante bellum*. The material gains of the English secured by this treaty were not "very impressive", though they were put to a great financial strain which led Hastings to take recourse to objectionable financial methods. Nevertheless, it marks a turning-point in the history of British supremacy in India. It gave them "peace with the Marāthas for twenty years" and thus left them comparatively free to fight their other enemies like Tipu and the French and to bring the Nizām and the Nawāb of Oudh under their control. But we shall over-emphasise its importance if we say that "it established beyond dispute the dominance of the British as the controlling factor in Indian politics, their subsequent rise in 1818 to the position of a paramount power being an inevitable result of the position gained by the Treaty of Salbai".

As a matter of fact, though Hastings had been able to save the British position in India in the face of an extremely embarrassing situation, it could hardly be regarded as being completely secure. The Company had still to reckon with the jealousy and hostility of the Marāthas and Tipu, and to be on guard against the activities of the powers that had been rising in the Punjab, Nepāl and Burma. Mr. (later Sir John) Macpherson, the senior member of the Council, who acted as the Governor-General for a year and a half till the arrival of Lord Cornwallis, had neither the ability nor the integrity to continue efficiently the policy of his predecessor. Further, section 34 of Pitt's India Act, 1784, enjoined the Company to follow a policy of non-intervention in Indian politics. Though, owing to the rather insecure position of the Company in India, this policy could not be strictly followed either by Cornwallis or by Shore, yet the period extending from the departure of Hastings till the commencement of Lord Wellesley's administration was one of comparative political inactivity on the part of the English in India.

B. The Marāthas after Salbai

The Marātha confederacy had indeed been greatly weakened by this time through the "mutual distrust and selfish intrigues" of its members, who owned only a loose allegiance to it. But there appeared among the Marāthas some able personalities like Ahalyā Bāī, Mahādājī Sindhia and Nānā Fadnavis. In the words of Sir John Malcolm, whose knowledge of Marātha affairs of the time was based on personal investigations, "the success of Ahalya Baee in the internal administration of her domains was altogether won-

derful.[1] . . . In the most sober view that can be taken of her character, she certainly appears, within her limited sphere, to have been one of the purest and most exemplary rulers that ever existed". Ahalyā Bāī died in 1795, when the government of Indore passed into the hands of Tukojī Holkar, a good soldier though devoid of political ability. Tukojī's death in 1797 was followed by chaos and confusion in the Indore kingdom.

Mahādājī Sindhia was the most outstanding Marātha chief of the period. The Treaty of Salbai recognised him as "as far as related to the British Government an independent prince", but at the same time he "continued to observe, on all other points which referred to his connexion with the Poona Government, the most scrupulous attention to forms". He utilised his new position to extend and consolidate his authority in Northern India. He soon abandoned the old Marātha method of fighting, maintained in his army a number of Rājputs and Muhammadans, and organised it on European scientific methods by employing Benoit de Boigne, a Savoyard (French) military expert, and other European adventurers of various races and classes. With a view to realising his ambitions in the north he went to Delhi, made the titular Emperor, Shāh 'Ālam II, already helpless in the midst of violence, confusion and anarchy, his puppet, and utilised the fiction of his sovereignty to establish Marātha supremacy rapidly in Hindustān. He obtained from the Emperor the office of *Wakil-i-mutluq* for his nominal master, the Peshwā, and himself became the Peshwā's *nāib* or deputy. He also gained the command over the imperial army. In fact, he remained in Northern India as "the nominal slave but the rigid master of the unfortunate Shah Alum, Emperor of Delhi". By 1792 Mahādājī established his ascendancy over the Rājputs and the Jāts and his power in Northern India reached its "meridian splendour". He next thought it necessary to establish his influence at Poona, where Nānā Fadnavis, an astute politician, controlled all affairs, and so proceeded to the south in June, 1792, apparently to pay his respects to the young Peshwā, Mādhava Rāo II. During Mahādājī Sindhia's absence from the north, his neighbour, Tukojī Holkar, challenged his authority but was severely defeated by his trained troops under de Boigne at Lakheri near Ajmer. Before his cherished object could be fulfilled, Sindhia died of fever at Poona on the 12th February, 1794, at the age of sixty-seven. His

[1] Some records originally kept at Maheshwar, the old capital of the Holkars, and recently brought to light (*Proceedings, Indian Historical Records Commission*, December, 1930) by Sardār Rāo Bahādur Kibe, M.A., Deputy Prime Minister, Indore State, "show what a leading part the pious lady Ahalyā Bāi took in the stirring events of the time".

vast possessions and military resources were inherited by his thirteen-year-old nephew and adopted son, Daulat Rāo Sindhia. Grant Duff has justly considered the death of Mahādājī Sindhia, a statesman of no mean order and an able military commander, "as an event of great political significance, both as it affected the Marātha Empire and the other states of India". It sealed the fate of Marātha supremacy in the north, where the English were left comparatively free to build up their dominion. The English must have regarded the success of Mahādājī in the north as opposed to their political interests, because judging "from the incessant perseverance with which he laboured to bring to maturity schemes once formed for his own aggrandisement, had his life been extended, he would in all probability have become a formidable antagonist to the interests of Great Britain, whose rulers were not unacquainted with his active spirit or insatiable ambition". As a matter of fact, we find in the records of the English "various proofs of watchful jealousy" of Mahādājī's movements.

Marātha affairs at the centre now passed under the absolute control of Nānā Fadnavis. One of the objects of Nānā was to recover the lost territories of the Marāthas to the south of the Narmadā. This made a collision with Tipu Sultān of Mysore inevitable. The Marāthas, therefore, concluded a treaty of alliance with the Nizām in July, 1784, and a Marātha army under the command of Hari Pant Phadke started from Poona on the 1st December, 1785. Tipu made some feeble attempts to oppose the invaders, but, apprehending the formation of an alliance between the English and the Marāthas, opened negotiations for peace, which was concluded in April, 1787. Tipu agreed to pay forty-five lacs of rupees, and to make over the districts of Badami, Kittur, and Nargund to the Marāthas, and got back the places which the latter had conquered. But this agreement between Tipu and the Marāthas did not last long, as on the outbreak of hostilities between the English and Tipu (A.D. 1789–1792), the Marāthas and the Nizām formed an offensive and defensive alliance with Cornwallis against the Sultan of Mysore. This triple alliance became for some time, in spite of section 34 of Pitt's India Act, "a definite factor in Indian politics".

It rested, however, on too insecure a basis to be effective for a long time, as the allies had united together only to serve their respective interests against the aggressions of Tipu and not out of any feeling of sincere attachment towards one another. The Nizām was an old foe of the Marāthas, and as soon as the danger on the part of Tipu had been somewhat lessened, all the Marātha

leaders—the Peshwā, Daulat Rāo Sindhia, Tukojī Holkar and the Rājā of Berar—combined together against him. The Peshwā's claim to *chauth* and *sardeshmukhi* over the Nizām served as the immediate cause for war. The Nizām's troops had been trained by the Frenchman, Raymond,[1] and all negotiations having failed, the two parties were driven to "decide their differences by the sword". The Nizām appealed to the English for help, but got nothing from them. He was defeated by the Marāthas at Kharda or Kurdla (fifty-six miles south-east of Ahmadnagar) in March, 1795, and was compelled to conclude a humiliating treaty which subjected him to heavy pecuniary losses and to large territorial concessions. Had Shore intervened, the result of the battle might have been different. His critics point out that the Nizām was entitled to British support on the strength of the treaty of February, 1768, by which the Nizām had placed himself under the protection of the English. But it might be argued in defence of Shore that he was precluded from such intervention by section 34 of Pitt's India Act. Further, the Marāthas were then at peace with the English, who were not bound by any previous agreement to help the Nizām against a friendly power.

2. Anglo-Mysore Relations

A. The First Anglo-Mysore War

Mysore under Hyder and Tipu was a source of danger to the rising British power in India during the second half of the eighteenth century. While the Carnatic was distracted by wars, and Bengal was passing through political revolutions, Hyder steadily rose to power in Mysore. Originally an adventurer, he entered the service of Nanjrāj, the *Dalwai* or prime minister of Mysore, who had made himself the practical dictator over the titular Hindu ruler of the State. Though uneducated and illiterate, Hyder was endowed with a strong determination, admirable courage, keen intellect and shrewd common sense. Taking advantage of the prevailing distractions in the south, he increased his power and soon supplanted his former patron. He extended his territories by conquering Bednore, Sunda, Sera, Canara, and Guti and by subjugating the petty Poligārs of South India.[2] The rapid rise of Hyder

[1] The Nizām kept "two battalions of female sepoys" who "took part in the battle and behaved no worse than the rest of the army". *Bengal: Past and Present*, 1933.

[2] The eighteenth-century history of India was largely influenced by the rise of adventurers to power: 'Ālīvardī in Bengal, Sa'ādat and Safdar Jang in Oudh, Saif-ud-daulah in the Punjab, and the Nizām-ul-mulk, Hyder and Tipu in South India.

naturally excited the jealousy of the Marāthas, the Nizām and the English. The Marāthas invaded his territories in A.D. 1765 and compelled him to surrender Guti and Savanur and to pay an indemnity of thirty-two lacs of rupees. In November, 1766, the Madras Government agreed to assist the Nizām against Hyder in return for his ceding the Northern Sarkārs. In short, the Marāthas, the Nizām, and the English entered into a triple alliance against Hyder. But the Marāthas, who first attacked Mysore, were soon bought off by the Mysore chief. The Nizām, accompanied by a company of British troops under the command of General Joseph Smith, invaded Mysore in April, 1767, but, influenced by Mahfuz Khān, brother and rival of the pro-British Nawāb Muhammad 'Ālī of the Carnatic, he quickly deserted the English and allied himself with their enemy. It should be noted that the Madras Government failed to manage affairs skilfully, but Smith was able to defeat the new allies at the Pass of Changama and Trinomali in September, 1767. Hyder was soon abandoned by his fickle ally, the Nizām, with whom the Madras Government tactlessly concluded an ill-advised treaty on the 23rd February, 1768. By this the Nizām confirmed his old treaty obligations in as irresponsible a manner as he had broken them; and declaring Hyder a "rebel and usurper" he agreed to assist the English and the Nawāb of the Carnatic in chastising him. This alliance with the vacillating Nizām was of no help to the English, but it needlessly provoked the hostility of Hyder. "You have brought us into such a labyrinth of difficulties," observed the Court of Directors, "that we do not see how we shall be extricated from them." The Court of Directors, then not in favour of the further expansion of British territories in India but eager to preserve what had already been acquired, further wrote: ". . . it is not for the Company to take the part of umpires of Indostan. If it had not been for the imprudent measures you have taken, the country powers would have formed a balance among themselves. We wish to see the Indian princes remain as a check upon one another without our interfering."

In spite of the Nizām's desertion Hyder continued to fight with great vigour. He recovered Mangalore after defeating the Bombay troops, appeared within five miles of Madras in March, 1769, and dictated a peace on the 4th April, 1769, which provided for the exchange of prisoners and mutual restitution of conquests. It was also a defensive alliance, as the English promised to help Hyder in case he was attacked by any other power

B. The Second Anglo-Mysore War

The terms of the treaty of 1769 were not fulfilled by the Madras Government. When the Marāthas invaded Hyder's territories in 1771, the English did not help him. This naturally offended the Mysore ruler, who remained on the look-out for an opportunity to strike once again. In 1779 he joined in a grand confederacy against the English, which was organised by the discontented Nizām and to which the Marāthas, already at war with the Bombay Government, were a party. The British capture of Mahé, a small French settlement within the jurisdiction of Hyder, added to his resentment. He held that the neutrality of his kingdom had thus been violated, and declared war. Thus, as Hastings said, there was "a war actual or impending in every quarter and with every power in Hindustān". Outside India, also, France, Spain, Holland and the revolted American colonies had combined against England, and France sought to utilise this opportunity to regain her lost position in India. The Dutch in the Coromandel concluded a treaty with Hyder on the 29th July, 1781, which was ratified on the 4th September.

In July, 1780, Hyder, with about 80,000 men and 100 guns, came down upon the plains of the Carnatic "like an avalanche, carrying destruction with him". He defeated an English detachment under Colonel Baillie and in October, 1780, seized Arcot. The situation was indeed a critical one for the Company. In the words used by Sir Alfred Lyall, "the fortunes of the English in India had fallen to their lowest water-mark". But Warren Hastings soon sent to the south Sir Eyre Coote, the victor of Wandiwāsh and then Commander-in-Chief in India and a member of the Supreme Council, "to stand forth and vindicate in his own person the rights and honour of British arms". He also detached the Rājā of Berār, Mahādājī Sindhia and the Nizām from alliance with Hyder. Nothing daunted by these desertions, Hyder continued the war with his usual firmness and vigour, but Sir Eyre Coote defeated him severely at Porto Novo in 1781. The English captured Trincomali, the best harbour in Ceylon, from the Dutch in January, 1782, and their settlements in India, such as Negapatam (in November 1781), Sadras and Pulicat in South India and those in Bengal and Bihār by the end of 1781. An English force under Colonel Braithwaite was, however, defeated by the Mysore troops. Early in 1782 a French squadron under the command of Admiral Suffren appeared in Indian waters, and in the month of February next Du Chemin came with 2,000 men under his command. After some

indecisive engagements of the English with the French and the Mysore troops, active hostilities ceased with the commencement of the rainy season. Hyder was not destined to fight any longer. The fatal effects of cancer resulted in his exit from this world at an advanced age on the 7th December, 1782. On the English side. Coote had retired owing to ill-health, leaving General Stuart in command of the Company's troops. He died at Madras in April, 1783.

Hyder was one of the ablest personalities in the history of India, who rose from obscurity to power during the distractions of the eighteenth century. A completely self-made man, he was endowed with strong determination, admirable courage, a keen intellect and a retentive memory, which more than counterbalanced his lack of the ability to read and write. Cool, sagacious, and intrepid in the field, he was remarkably tactful and vigorous in matters of administration, and had all business of the State transacted before his eyes with regularity and quickness. Easily accessible to all, he had the wonderful capacity of giving attention to various subjects at the same time without being distracted by any one of these. It would be unfair to describe him as an "absolutely unscrupulous" man, who "had no religion, no morals, and no compassion", as Dr. Smith has done. Though he did not strictly follow the external observances of his religion, he had a sincere religious conscience, and Wilks has described him as the "most tolerant" of all Muhammadan princes. Bowring gives a fair estimate of him in the following words: ". . . he was a bold, an original, and an enterprising commander, skilful in tactics and fertile in resources, full of energy and never desponding in defeat. He was singularly faithful to his engagements, and straight-forward in his policy towards the British. Notwithstanding the severity of his internal rule, and the terror which he inspired, his name is always mentioned in Mysore with respect if not with admiration. While the cruelties which he sometimes practised are forgotten, his prowess and success have an abiding place in the memory of the people." Hyder's modern Indian biographer justly remarks that "an autocratic soldier-ruler", he "was a very successful administrator"[1].

Tipu, as brave and warlike as his father, continued the war against the English. Brigadier Mathews, appointed by the Bombay Government to the supreme command, was captured with all his men by Tipu in 1783. On the 23rd June of the same year news of a peace between the English and the French reached India. Colonel Fullarton captured Coimbatore in November, 1783, and

[1] N. K. Sinha, *Haidar Ali*, p. 270.

intended to fall upon Tipu's capital, Seringapatam, but he was recalled by the authorities at Madras, where Lord Macartney had been eager for a peace with Tipu since his arrival as Governor and had sent envoys to his camp. Thus the Treaty of Mangalore was concluded in March, 1784, on the basis of mutual restitution of conquests and liberation of the prisoners. Warren Hastings did not like the terms of the treaty in the least and exclaimed, "What a man is this Lord Macartney! I yet believe that, in spite of the peace, he will effect the loss of the Carnatic."

C. The Third Anglo-Mysore War

Lord Cornwallis (1786–1793) came to India bound by Pitt's India Act to refrain from following a policy of war and conquest, except for purely defensive purposes. But he soon came to realise that it was not possible to follow strictly the injunctions of the said Act, which, as he expressed it, was "attended with the unavoidable inconvenience of our (the Company's) being constantly exposed to the necessity of commencing a war without having previously secured the assistance of efficient allies".[1] Taking into consideration the facts of international politics, he rightly believed that Anglo-French hostility in Europe was bound to have its repercussions in India and that Tipu, allying himself with the French, would surely strike once more against the English. "I look upon a rupture with Tipu", he wrote to Malet, Resident at Poona, in March, 1788, "as a certain and immediate consequence of a war with France, and in that event a vigorous co-operation of the Marāthas would certainly be of the utmost importance to our interests in the country."

As a matter of fact, the Treaty of Mangalore was nothing but a "hollow truce". Tipu also knew that the renewal of hostilities with the English was inevitable, because both were aiming at political supremacy over the Deccan. A ruler like Tipu could hardly remain satisfied with the arrangement of 1784. He tried to enlist for himself the support of France and of Constantinople, and sent envoys to both places in 1787; but he received only "promises of future help and no active assistance for the present".

Certain factors soon led to the third Anglo-Mysore conflict. In 1788 Lord Cornwallis obtained Guntur in the Northern Sarkārs from the Nizām, who in return asked for British help on the strength of the Treaty of Masulipatam, 1768. Cornwallis now took a course

[1] Letter to Malet, 28th February, 1790, Forest, *State Papers about Cornwallis*, Vol. II, p. 10.

of action which amounted to a violation of the Act of 1784 in the spirit if not in the letter. He wrote a letter to the Nizām on the 7th July, 1789, with a view to laying "the foundation of a permanent and powerful co-operation". He deliberately omitted Tipu's name from the letter, which was declared to be as binding "as a treaty in due form could be". Wilks, the historian of Southern India at this time, remarks that "it is highly instructive to observe a statesman, justly extolled for moderate and pacific dispositions, thus indirectly violating a law, enacted for the enforcement of these virtues, by entering into a very intelligible offensive alliance". "The liberal construction of the restrictions of the Act of Parliament had upon this occasion," remarks Sir John Malcolm, "the effect of making the Governor-General pursue a course which was not only questionable in point of faith but which must have been more offensive to Tipoo Sultan and more calculated to produce a war with France than an avowed contract of defensive engagement framed for the express and legitimate purpose of limiting his inordinate ambition."

This was indeed a sufficient provocation to Tipu. But the immediate cause of the war, which had been foreseen both by Tipu and Cornwallis, was the attack on Travancore by the former on the 29th December, 1789. The Rājā of Travancore was an old ally of the Company according to the Treaty of Mangalore and was entitled to the protection of the English. He applied to John Holland, Governor of Madras, for help but the Madras Government paid no heed. Lord Cornwallis, however, considered Tipu's attack on Travancore to be an act of war and severely condemned the conduct of the Madras Government. Both the Nizām and the Marāthas, who apprehended that the growth of Tipu was prejudicial to their interests and were thus not well disposed towards him, entered into a "Triple Alliance" with the English on the 1st June and 4th July, 1790, respectively. The troops of the Marāthas and of the Nizām rendered useful services to the English in the course of the war, as Lord Cornwallis himself admitted.

The Third Anglo-Mysore War was carried on for about two years in three campaigns. The first under Major-General Medows did not produce any decisive result, as Tipu displayed "greater skill in strategy" than Medows. Lord Cornwallis wrote to Henry Dundas of the Board of Control: ". . . we have lost time and our adversary has gained reputation, which are two most valuable things in war." He personally assumed command of the British troops on 29th January, 1791, when he also formed the project of

deposing Tipu in favour of the heir of the old Hindu ruling dynasty of Mysore. Marching through Vellore and Ambur to Bangalore, which was captured on the 21st March, 1791, he reached Arikera, about nine miles east of Seringapatam, Tipu's capital, by the 13th May. But on this occasion too Tipu displayed brilliant generalship; and when the rains set in, Cornwallis had to retreat to Mangalore owing to the utter lack of equipment and provisions for his army. The fighting was resumed in the summer of 1791, and Tipu captured Coimbatore on the 3rd November. But Cornwallis, with the help of an army sent from Bombay, soon occupied the hill-forts that lay in his path towards Seringapatam, arrived near it on the 5th February, 1792, and attacked its outworks. By his military and diplomatic skill Tipu averted a complete disaster, but he realised the impossibility of further resistance.

After some preliminary negotiations, the Treaty of Seringapatam was concluded in March, 1792. Tipu had to surrender half of his dominions, out of which a large portion, stretching from the Kṛishṇā to beyond the Penar river, was given to the Nizām, and a portion to the Marāthas, which extended their territory to the Tuṅgabhadrā. The English acquired Malabar and sovereignty over the Rājā of Coorg, to whom Tipu had to grant independence; Dindigul and the adjoining districts on the south; and the Baramahal district on the east. These were "cessions of considerable importance in adding to the strength and compactness of the Company's territories". Moreover, Tipu had to pay an indemnity of more than £3,000,000 and to send two of his sons as hostages to Cornwallis's camp.

Some writers have criticised Lord Cornwallis for having concluded the treaty with the Sultān of Mysore instead of effecting his destruction, which, in their opinion, could have been easily done. Munro wrote: "Everything is now done by moderation and conciliation. At this rate we shall be Quakers in twenty years more." Thornton regrets that Tipu "should have been granted so favourable terms". But it should be noted that Cornwallis took this step out of some practical considerations. Sickness was spreading among his troops; war with France, and the consequent alliance between Tipu and the French, were apprehended; and the Court of Directors insisted on peace. Further, Cornwallis was not at all eager to occupy the whole kingdom of Mysore, which, in his opinion, would have made it difficult to effect a convenient settlement with the allies.

3. British Relations with Hyderābād and the Carnatic

A. The Nizām of Hyderābād

Like the governors of the other provinces, the Nizām-ul-mulk Asaf Jāh, though theoretically a representative of the Delhi Emperor in the Deccan, had made himself virtually independent of the latter's authority in the reign of Muhammad Shāh. But the authority of his son, Nizām 'Ālī, was menaced by the growing ambitions of the Marāthas and the Sultāns of Mysore, which led him to court British help. On the 12th November, 1766, he concluded an offensive and defensive alliance with the Madras Council. In the course of the First Anglo-Mysore War, he was temporarily seduced from this alliance by an agent of Hyder 'Ālī, but he soon concluded a peace with the English at Masulipatam on the 23rd February, 1768. According to the treaty of 1766, as revised in 1768, the Company promised to pay an annual tribute of nine lacs of rupees to the Nizām in return for the latter's granting them the Northern Sarkārs. The *sarkār* of Guntur being given for life to the Nizām's brother, Basālat Jang, the amount of tribute was reduced to seven lacs. But in 1779 Rumbold, the tactless governor of Madras, secured the *sarkār* of Guntur directly from Basālat Jang and sought to stop the payment of tribute to the Nizām, who had violated the treaty of 1768 by taking French troops into his service. This was disapproved of by the Governor-General, Warren Hastings, but it served to alienate the Nizām, whose resentment had been already aroused by the English alliance with Raghoba, at a very critical moment. He joined in an anti-English confederacy with Hyder and the Marāthas. Hastings, however, succeeded in detaching the Nizām from the confederates by returning Guntur to Basālat Jang when the Second Anglo-Mysore War had already progressed to the disadvantage of the English.

But after the death of Basālat Jang in 1782, the English demanded the cession of Guntur from the Nizām on the strength of the treaty of 1768. Guntur occupied a position of importance both for the Nizām and the English; for the former it was the only outlet to the sea, and for the latter its possession was necessary to connect their possessions in the north with those in the south. After some hesitation the Nizām surrendered Guntur to the English in 1788 and in return sought their help, according to the treaty of 1768, to recover some of his districts which Tipu had seized. Lord Cornwallis, the then Governor-General, found himself in a delicate

position, because the right of the Mysore Sultāns to those very territories had been recognised by the English by two separate treaties concluded with Hyder and Tipu respectively in 1769 and 1785; and also because he was precluded by clause 34 of Pitt's India Act from declaring war against Indian powers or concluding a treaty with that object without being previously attacked. But at the same time he was eager to secure allies in view of the certain war with Tipu. So he wrote a letter to the Nizām on the 7th July, 1789, explaining the treaty of 1768 to suit his motives, and agreeing to support the Nizām with British troops, which could not be employed against the allies of the English, a list of whom was included, Tipu's name being deliberately excluded from it. Thus the Nizām joined the Triple Alliance of 1790 and fought for the English in the Third Anglo-Mysore War.

As we have already noted, Sir John Shore, in pursuance of the neutrality policy laid down by Pitt's India Act, did not lend assistance to the Nizām against the Marāthas, who severely defeated him at Kharda in March, 1795.

B. The Carnatic

The Carnatic, distracted by the Anglo-French conflicts of the mid-eighteenth century, afterwards suffered terribly from the evils of a demoralised administration, due partly to the disreputable character of its Nawāb, Muhammad 'Ālī, and partly to the vacillating and selfish policy of the Madras Government. "The moral atmosphere of Madras appears at this time," remarks Thornton, "to have been pestilential; corruption revelled unrestrained; and strong indeed must have been the power which could effectually repress it while Mahomet Ali (Muhammad 'Ālī) had purposes to gain and either money or promises to bestow." Ceasing to reside at Arcot, Muhammad 'Ālī spent his days in a magnificent palace at Chepauk, a fishing village in the suburb of Madras, steeped in pleasure and luxury, to meet the extravagant expenses of which he borrowed lavishly from the Company's servants at Madras at exorbitant rates of interest, sometimes rising as high as 36 per cent. per annum, and granting them assignments on the land revenues of the Carnatic districts. He was not, declared Burke, "a real potentate", but "a shadow, a dream, an incubus of oppression". The "Nabob of Arcot's Debts", through which the European bond-holders, including some members of the Madras Council, amassed huge fortunes at the expense of the interests of the kingdom, gave rise to serious administrative scandals and so the

British Parliament tried to deal with them. But the Board of Control intervened in the matter and ordered that the debts of the Nawāb should be paid out of the revenues of the Carnatic. This decision of the ministry, denounced by Burke and others, dealt a severe blow "at the cause of pure administration in the East". According to an arrangement dated the 2nd December, 1781, the revenues of the Carnatic had been assigned to British control, the Nawāb being given one-sixth for his maintenance. But now that the creditors of the Nawāb clamoured for their money, the Board of Control ordered the restitution of the revenues to the Nawāb, who went on plunging himself all the deeper into debt.

Thus the relations between Muhammad 'Ālī and the Company were very complicated when Lord Cornwallis came to India as the Company's Governor-General for the first time. On the 24th February, 1787, the English concluded a treaty with the Nawāb, by which they agreed to defend the whole country in return for a subsidy of fifteen lacs of *pagodas* (a coin current in Southern India corresponding at the normal rate of exchange to three and a half rupees). But during the war with Tipu (1790–1792) the Company took into its own hands the entire control of the Carnatic intending "to secure the two states (the Carnatic and Madras)", as Malcolm says, "against the dangers to which they thought them exposed from the mismanagement of the Nawāb's officers". At the close of the war a treaty was concluded on the 12th July, 1792, by which the Carnatic was restored to its Nawāb and at the same time the British subsidy was reduced from fifteen lacs of *pagodas* to nine lacs.

Muhammad 'Ālī died on the 13th October, 1795, and his son and successor, Omdut-ul-Umarā, could not be persuaded by Lord Hobart, Governor of Madras since September, 1794, to modify the treaty of 1792 to the extent of giving to the Company all the territories which had been pledged as security for arrears of pecuniary instalments. The new Nawāb, "perplexed, plagued and intimidated" by his creditors, would not accede to the proposals. The desire of the Madras governor to go to the length of annexing Tinnevelly was not supported by the Governor-General, Sir John Shore. The corruption in the Carnatic Government continued unabated, owing, as Mill aptly expresses it, to "the compound of opposition of the Supreme Government and of the powerful class of individuals whose profit depended upon the misgovernment of the country. . . ."

4. British Relations with Oudh, Benares and Ruhelkhand

A. Warren Hastings' Oudh Policy and the Ruhela War

Since the Anglo-Oudh treaty of 1765, the Company was definitely resolved to maintain friendly relations with Oudh with a view to utilising it as a bulwark against the incursions of the Marāthas or of the Afghāns. Thus when in 1770–1771 the Delhi Emperor, Shāh 'Ālam II, placed himself under Marātha tutelage, Warren Hastings deprived the Emperor of the districts of Korā and Allahābād and made these over to the Nawāb of Oudh in return for fifty lacs of rupees and an annual subsidy to maintain a garrison of the Company's troops for the Nawāb's protection. This arrangement was ratified by the Treaty of Benares, September, 1773, when Hastings had a conference with the Nawāb.

But this policy of Hastings drew the Company into a war with the Ruhelas. The fertile country of Ruhelkhand, lying at the base of the Himālayas to the north-west of Oudh, with a population of about 6,000,000, the bulk of whom were Hindus, and governed by a confederacy of Ruhela chiefs under the leadership of Hāfiz Rahamat Khān, had been threatened by the Marāthas since 1771. The Nawāb of Oudh also coveted the province of Ruhelkhand and there was no love lost between him and the Afghāns of that tract. But the common Marātha danger led the Ruhelas and Shujā-ud-daulah, the Nawāb of Oudh, to sign a treaty on the 17th June, 1772, in the presence of Sir Robert Barker. It provided that if the Marāthas invaded Ruhelkhand, the Nawāb of Oudh would expel them, for which the Ruhelas would pay him forty lacs of rupees. The Marāthas invaded Ruhelkhand in the spring of 1773, but they were repulsed by the combined British and Oudh troops and could not think of repeating their incursions owing to the disorders at Poona after the death of the Peshwā, Mādhava Rāo I. The Nawāb of Oudh then demanded from the Ruhela leader the payment of the stipulated sum of forty lacs of rupees, which was, however, evaded by the latter. On the strength of the Treaty of Benares (September, 1773), Shujā-ud-daulah demanded, early in February, 1774, the help of the Company to coerce Hāfiz Rahamat Khān. A British army was accordingly sent under the command of Colonel Champion; and the allied British and Oudh troops marched into Ruhelkhand on the 17th April, 1774. Six days later, the decisive battle was fought at Miranpur Katra. The Ruhelas were defeated though, as the British commander observed, they exhibited "great bravery and resolution". Hāfiz Rahamat was

killed fighting bravely; about 20,000 Ruhelas were expelled beyond the Ganges; and their province was annexed to the Oudh kingdom, only a fragment of it, together with Rāmpurā, being left in the possession of Faizullah Khān, son of 'Ālī Muhammad Ruhela, the founder of the Ruhela power.

Opinions are sharply divided on the merits and demerits of Hastings' policy in the Ruhela War. It was one of the main points of attack on Hastings in Parliament in 1786. Not only Burke and Macaulay but also most of the older school of historians, like Mill and others, have condemned it in severe terms. In their opinion, Hastings "deliberately sold the lives and liberties of a free people and condoned horrible atrocities on the part of the armies of the Nawāb of Oudh". But the policy has found defenders in some modern writers, notably in Sir John Strachey, who has tried in his *Hastings and the Rohilla War* to justify it wholly. Though some of the expressions of Burke, Macaulay or Mill may be regarded as unjust invective, the policy of Hastings cannot escape reasonable criticism from certain points of view. One has to note that the expediency of the transaction was doubted by Hastings himself and still more by his Council, and they treated it during its initial stages with vacillation. Hastings might have thought, while concluding the Treaty of Benares, that the occasion for helping the Nawāb of Oudh would never arise; but to be committed to a course of action, without duly weighing the remote consequences involved in it, is not, in the words Mr. P. E. Roberts, "the happiest or most efficient kind of political conduct". It is also difficult to support the view that Hastings was in duty bound to lend assistance to the Nawāb of Oudh as the treaty between the latter and the Ruhelas had been concluded under British guarantee. Sir Robert Barker had merely witnessed the signatures of the two parties and did nothing else regarding it. Further, it is improper to argue, as Sir John Strachey has done, that the Ruhelas deserved expulsion from their province as they had established their rule over its Hindu population only twenty-five years before. It is clear that their title to the province was as good as that of many of the Indian States of the time which were rising on the ruins of the Mughul Empire. We have contemporary evidence, which could not be quite ignored even by Sir John Strachey, to show that the Hindus of Ruhelkhand were well governed and enjoyed prosperity under the Ruhelas; it was the new Oudh rule that proved to be oppressive to them. Even Sir John Strachey has to admit that Hastings' policy was "somewhat cynical". Lastly, the Ruhelas cannot be accused of having

in any way offended the English. Sir Alfred Lyall very reasonably observes that "the expedition against the Rohillas was wrong in principle, for they had not provoked us, and the Vezir could only be relied upon to abuse his advantages". The whole transaction smacks of selfish motives, mainly of a mercenary character, and it undoubtedly set a bad precedent. Its nature is clear from what Hastings himself avowed: "The absence of the Marāthas, and the weak state of the Rohillas, promised an easy conquest of them, and I own that such was my idea of the Company's distress at home added to my knowledge of their wants abroad, that I should have been glad of any occasion to employ their forces, that saves so much of their pay and expenses."

B. The Chait Singh Affair

Mercenary motives led Hastings to commit two more indefensible acts. In one case, he made exorbitant demands on Chait Singh, the Rājā of Benares. Originally a feudatory of the Nawāb of Oudh, Chait Singh placed himself under the overlordship of the Company by a treaty in July, 1775, whereby he agreed to pay an annual tribute of 22½ lacs of rupees to his new masters. But with the outbreak of Anglo-French hostilities in 1778, Hastings demanded from the Rājā an additional sum of five lacs as a war contribution, which he paid. The demand was, however, repeated several times, and the Rājā after pleading for time and exemption complied with it on every occasion. This did not suffice to satisfy Hastings. In 1780 he ordered the Rājā to furnish 2,000 cavalry, reduced at the latter's request to 1,000. The Rājā gathered 500 cavalry and 500 infantry as substitute, and informed Hastings that they were ready for serving the Company; but he received no reply. Hastings had already determined to inflict on him a fine of fifty lacs of rupees. "I was resolved," he said, "to draw from his guilt the means of relief to the Company's distress. . . . In a word I had determined to make him pay largely for his pardon, or to exact a severe vengeance for his past delinquency." To carry out his plans Hastings went in person to Benares and placed the Rājā under arrest. The Rājā submitted quietly; but the indignity inflicted upon him infuriated his soldiers, who rose suddenly, without their master's instigation or his knowledge, and massacred a number of English sepoys with three officers. Hastings retired for his personal safety to Chunār, but soon gathering all the available troops suppressed the rising. Chait Singh justly argued his innocence in regard to complicity in the massacre; but to no effect. He was

expelled from his country and found shelter at Gwālior. His kingdom was conferred upon his nephew, who was to pay a tribute of forty lacs, instead of 22½ lacs, to the Company.

Whatever might be said by the modern apologists of Hastings, there is no doubt that his conduct in the Chait Singh affair was "cruel, unjust and oppressive", as Pitt observed at the time of his impeachment. Chait Singh was wrongly described as a mere zamindār, and not a ruling prince, by the defenders of Hastings. Even if they could have proved him to be a mere zamindār, one might very well question the justice of fleecing him and him alone and not imposing a common tax on all the zamindārs. The treaty of 5th July, 1775, which still regulated the relations between the Rājā and the Company, definitely laid down that "no demand shall be made upon him by the Hon'ble Company, of any kind, or on any pretence whatsoever, nor shall any person be allowed to interfere with his authority, or to disturb the peace of his country". So legally the Rājā was not bound to pay any extra contribution. Forrest makes a gross mis-statement of facts when he says that the Rājā's conduct was "contumacious and refractory and deserving of punishment". As a matter of fact, Chait Singh was all along submissive and his men rose in insurrection without his connivance only when their master had been humiliated. Unbiased writers must accept the reasonable verdict of Sir Alfred Lyall that "Hastings must bear the blame of having provoked the insurrection at Benares" and that there was "a touch of impolitic severity and precipitation about his proceedings against Chait Singh" due to a "certain degree of vindictiveness and private irritation against the Rājā". It is amply clear that the whole transaction was iniquitous from the moral point of view. It was also inexpedient. Dr. V. A. Smith has tried to defend Hastings' exorbitant demands on the ground of expediency in view of the "grave necessities" of the disturbed political situation of the time. But the Governor-General did not make any financial gain, as the Rājā took away with him a portion of his wealth, and the remaining twenty-three lacs was looted by the troops to be divided among themselves. The Company on the contrary was put to the strain of bearing the cost of the military operations that followed. Thus the Court of Directors justly criticised Hastings' policy as "unwarrantable and impolitic". Further, the Company obtained the enhanced tribute of forty lacs from the new Rājā of Benares at a great sacrifice of the interests of the principality, the administration of which became worse under their protégé.

C. The Case of the Begams of Oudh

After the death of Shujā-ud-daulah, a shrewd, industrious and clever administrator, on the 26th January, 1775, his son and successor, Asaf-ud-daulah, unwisely allowed his liabilities to the Company to be increased by entering into a new treaty with them known as the Treaty of Faizābād—particularly binding himself thereby to pay a heavier subsidy for the maintenance of British troops. The administration of Oudh grew more and more corrupt under the new Nawāb, and the subsidy payable to the Company fell into arrears. The Begams of Oudh, mother and grandmother of the reigning prince, had inherited from the deceased Nawāb extensive *jāgīrs* and immense wealth, which, however, Asaf-ud-daulah, pressed by the Company for money, sought to seize on the ground that he had been unjustly deprived of them. In 1775, on the representations of Middleton, the British Resident in Oudh, the widow of Shujā-ud-daulah gave to her son £300,000, in addition to £250,000 already paid to him, the British Resident and the Council in Calcutta having given a guarantee that no further demands should be made on her in future. Hastings, opposed to his Council at this time, was outvoted. When in 1781 the Nawāb of Oudh, pressed by the British Resident, proposed that he should be permitted to seize the property and wealth of the Begams to clear off his dues to the Company, Hastings had no hesitation in consenting to it and in withdrawing British protection from them. The Nawāb soon began to waver and was afraid, as the Resident remarked, of the "uncommonly violent temper of his female relations"; but Hastings helped to screw up his courage. The Governor-General wrote to Middleton in December, 1781: "You must not allow any negotiations or forbearance, but must prosecute both services until the Begams are at the entire mercy of the Nawāb." British troops were sent to Faizābād, where the Begams lived; and their eunuchs were compelled by imprisonment, starvation and threat, if not actual infliction, of flogging, to surrender the treasure in December, 1782.

The conduct of Hastings on this occasion exceeded all limits of decency and justice. "The employment of personal severities, under the superintendence of British officers, in order to extract money from women and eunuchs," observes Sir Alfred Lyall rightly, "is an ignoble kind of undertaking; . . . to cancel the guarantee and leave the Nawāb to deal with the recalcitrant princes was justifiable; to push him on and actively assist in measures of coercion against women and eunuchs was conduct unworthy

and indefensible." There can be no doubt that Hastings was the "moving spirit" in the whole transaction. Hastings argued, and his defenders maintain, that the Begams had forfeited their claim to British protection for their complicity in the affair of Chait Singh. The contention is hardly tenable. The testimony in regard to it is conflicting and "the charge of rebellion was *ex post facto*, made when it was found necessary to present a justification for the whole business".

In his last year of office Hastings made some unsuccessful attempts to reorganise the administration and finances of Oudh. Under the orders of the Court of Directors, he effected a partial restitution of the *jāgīrs* to the Begams, and removed the British Residency, but established in its place "an agency of the Governor-General" which proved to be a heavier burden on the resources of the State.

D. Policy of Cornwallis and Shore towards Oudh

In fact, Oudh continued to groan under the evils of maladministration and the burden of the Company's financial demands. In the time of Lord Cornwallis, the Nawāb appealed to him to relieve him of the "oppressive pecuniary burden" by withdrawing the Company's troops stationed at Cawnpore and Fatehgarh. After meeting the Nawāb's minister Hyder Beg in a conference, the Governor-General agreed to reduce the subsidies from seventy-four to fifty lacs but objected to the withdrawal of British troops.

Hyder Beg was really an able minister, eager to reform the administration, but with his death in 1794, all hope of reform came to an end. On the death of Asaf-ud-daulah in 1797, Sir John Shore intervened in the case of disputed succession between Wāzīr 'Ālī, whom Asaf-ud-daulah had looked upon as his successor, and Sa'ādat 'Ālī, the deceased Nawāb's eldest brother. He raised the latter to the throne and entered into a treaty with him on the 21st January, 1798. By this the annual subsidy to be paid by the Nawāb was raised to seventy-six lacs of rupees; the fort of Allahābād, described by Marshman as the "military key of the province", was ceded to the Company; the Nawāb bound himself not to hold communications with, or admit into his kingdom, the other Europeans; and Wāzīr 'Ālī was allowed to live at Benares on an annual pension of a lac and a half of rupees. This arrangement, no doubt, greatly enhanced the Company's influence, but in no way served to remove the corruption in the internal government of Oudh. Throughout this province, "there were in all respects embarrassment and

disorder. The British subsidy was always in arrear, while the most frightful extortion was practised in the realisation of the revenue. Justice was unknown; the army was a disorderly mass, formidable only to the power whom it professed to serve. The evils of native growth were aggravated by the presence of an extraordinary number of European adventurers, most of whom were as destitute of character and principle as they were of property."

CHAPTER IV

ESTABLISHMENT OF BRITISH ASCENDANCY, 1798–1823

1. Anglo-Marātha Relations and Fall of the Marāthas

A. The Marāthas after Kharda and the Second Anglo-Marātha War

THE victory of the Marāthas at Kharda enhanced their prestige and the influence of Nānā Fadnavis at Poona. But they were not destined to reap any permanent advantage out of it. It was at Kharda that the Marātha chiefs assembled under the authority of the Peshwā for the last time. Soon they spoiled all their chances by unwisely indulging in internal quarrels. The young Peshwā, Mādhava Rāo Nārāyan, grew tired of Nānā's dictatorship, and, in a fit of despair, committed suicide on the 25th October, 1795. The next in succession was Raghoba's son, Bājī Rāo II, a bitter foe of Nānā Fadnavis, whose claims were opposed by the minister. This led to various plots and counter-plots till at last Bājī Rāo II was recognised as the Peshwā and Nānā Fadnavis as his chief minister on the 4th December, 1796. Taking advantage of these dissensions among the Marāthas, the Nizām recovered the territories that he had been compelled to cede to them after his recent defeat at Kharda.

Devoid of military qualities, and fond of intrigue, Bājī Rāo II accentuated the rivalries of the Marātha leaders of the time, by setting one against another. Unfortunately for the Marātha nation, able leaders like Mahādājī Sindhia, Malhār Rāo Holkar and Tukojī Holkar had already left this world for ever. Their descendants, like Daulat Rāo Sindhia, a nephew and adopted son of Mahādājī Sindhia, and Jaswant Rāo Holkar, a natural son of Tukojī, utterly devoid of wisdom, only occupied themselves in mutual quarrels, to the prejudice of national interests, at a time when the Company's policy of non-intervention had given place to one of aggressive imperialism with the arrival of Lord Mornington (subsequently Marquess Wellesley) as Governor-General on the 26th April, 1798.

An imperialist to the tips of his fingers and possessed of experience of Indian affairs as Commissioner of the Board of Control, Wellesley came to guide the destiny of the Company in India at a time when

the political situation in this country was "extremely critical", as he himself said; and the Company was exposed to grave dangers, due largely to Shore's policy of neutrality. Tipu, the "ancient enemy of the Company", had greatly improved his resources, while his spirit of hostility was unabated; the Nizām was "reduced in reputation as well as in real strength" and had welcomed French support, being alienated by the English neutrality in 1795; the power of Daulat Rāo Sindhia "had arrived at a most alarming eminence"; the Rājās of the Malabar region, with the exception of the Rājā of Coorg, were hostile; there was constant apprehension of an invasion of the Indian plains by Zamān Shāh, the ruler of Kābul; and the finances of the Company were in an unsatisfactory condition. The influence of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars in Europe added to the gravity of the situation. The French had allied themselves with Tipu, and Napoleon had undertaken an expedition into Egypt with a view to threatening the British position in India.

To save the Company's position in this menacing situation, and to safeguard and further the interests of the British Empire as a whole, Wellesley followed the policy of subsidiary alliances with regard to the Indian powers. Indeed, the defence of England's Empire formed the keynote of Wellesley's policy. His system of subsidiary alliances implied that the Indian powers "were to make no wars and to carry on no negotiations with any other state whatsoever, without the knowledge and consent of the British Government. The greater principalities were each to maintain a native force commanded by British officers for the preservation of the public peace; and they were each to cede certain territories in full sovereignty to meet the yearly charges of this force. The lesser principalities were to pay a tribute to the paramount power. In return the British Government was to protect them, one and all, against foreign enemies of every sort or kind". Only a weak power would submit to such an arrangement, and the Nizām, the feeblest of all the Indian powers, readily accepted it. Some other Indian States were also conquered or mediatised by Wellesley.

The Marāthas had not come into any close contact with the English since Wellesley's accession to office. He had asked them on several occasions to enter his system "of defensive alliance and mutual guarantee" but got no response. "Hitherto," wrote Wellesley in 1800, "either the capricious temper of Bājī Rāo, or some remains of the characteristic jealousy of the nation with regard to foreign relations, have frustrated my object and views". But suddenly the course of affairs, even in Mahārāshtra, took such

a turn as to afford an opportunity to the English to intervene. The shrewd old Marātha statesman, Nānā Fadnavis, who had so long done his best to preserve in some form the solidarity of the Marātha confederacy and had hitherto resisted British interference in Marātha affairs, died at Poona on the 13th March, 1800. "With him," remarked Colonel Palmer, the British Resident at Poona, with prophetic truth, "departed all the wisdom and moderation of the Marātha Government." Though Nānā Fadnavis' attempt to establish hegemony at Poona, and his neglect of the north, have been considered by a modern Marāthī writer as shortcomings in his policy, yet it must be admitted that "he was", as Grant Duff observes, "certainly a great statesman . . . he is entitled to the high praise of having acted with the feelings and sincerity of a patriot". He understood the danger of English intervention in the affairs of the Marāthas and was opposed to any alliance with them. He "respected the English, admired their sincerity; but as political enemies, no one regarded them with more jealousy and alarm". His death meant the removal of the barrier that had checked to a great extent the disruptive activities of the Marātha chiefs. Both Daulat Rāo Sindhia and Jaswant Rāo Holkar now entered upon a fierce struggle with each other for supremacy at Poona, and the weak-minded Peshwā made matters worse by his incessant intrigues. Sindhia at first prevailed, and while he was engaged in fighting against Holkar's troops at Mālwa, the Peshwā murdered Vithujī Holkar, brother of Jaswant Rāo Holkar. This highly incensed Jaswant Rāo Holkar, whose power and position had recently improved, and on 23rd October he defeated the combined armies of Sindhia and the Peshwā at Poona and captured the city. After running from place to place, the Peshwā took refuge at Bassein. Jaswant Rāo Holkar placed Vināyak Rāo, son of Amrita Rāo, adopted son of Raghoba, on the Peshwā's *masnad*.

The Peshwā had for long declined to accept the Subsidiary Alliance, but now in his helpless situation applied for protection to Wellesley. This was what Wellesley wanted, because it fitted in with his plan of establishing control over the Marāthas. Bājī Rāo II consented to accept the Subsidiary Alliance and signed the Treaty of Bassein on the 31st December, 1802. As provided by this treaty, a subsidiary force, consisting "of not less than 6,000 regular infantry, with the usual proportion of field-artillery and European artillery-men", was to be stationed within the Peshwā's territory in perpetuity; and for its maintenance, territories yielding revenues worth twenty-six lacs of rupees were surrendered by the Peshwā. Bājī Rāo II further agreed not to entertain any European

hostile to the English and subjected his relations with other States to the control of the English. Thus he "sacrificed his independence as the price of protection". A British force under Arthur Wellesley conducted the Peshwā to his capital and restored him to his former position on the 13th May, 1803.

The Treaty of Bassein forms an important landmark in the history of British supremacy in India. "It was without question", to quote Dean Hutton, "a step which changed the footing on which we stood in Western India. It trebled the English responsibilities in an instant." It brought the Company into definite relations with the formal head of the Marātha confederacy, and henceforth it "had either to control the greatest Indian power, or was committed to hostilities with it". But there is no reason to overestimate its importance by holding, as Owen has done, that "the Treaty by its direct and indirect operations gave the Company the Empire of India". The British suzerainty over India was certainly not a foregone conclusion in 1803: a great deal had still to be achieved before it could be thoroughly established. The weak points of the Treaty of Bassein were criticised in England in a contemporary paper entitled *Observations on the Treaty of Bassein*, written by Lord Castlereagh, the successor, in May, 1801, of Dundas as President of the Board of Control. He was right in pointing out that it appeared "hopeless to attempt to govern the Marātha Empire through a feeble and perhaps disaffected Peshwā". He especially attacked that article of the treaty by which the Peshwā had to accept British arbitration in his disputes with other powers, and he had a just apprehension of the tendency of the treaty to involve the English "in the endless and complicated distractions of that turbulent (Marātha) Empire". Wellesley wrongly calculated that after the treaty there existed no reason "to justify an apprehension" of hostility with the Marātha chiefs, though at the same time he realised that even if any war actually broke out the advantages gained by the English as a result of the Treaty of Bassein would help them to meet their opponents successfully.

War was not long in coming. The Treaty of Bassein was, as the Governor-General's brother, Arthur Wellesley, aptly remarked, "a treaty with a cipher (the Peshwā)". It wounded the feelings of the other Marātha leaders, who saw in it an absolute surrender of national independence, and by sinking their mutual jealousies for the time being tried to present a united front to the British. The Peshwā, now repentant of his action, sent them secret messages of encouragement. Daulat Rāo Sindhia and

Raghujī Bhonsle II of Berār at once combined and also tried to win over Jaswant Rāo Holkar to their party. But even at this moment of grave national peril the Marātha chiefs could not act together. Though Sindhia and Raghujī Bhonsle II mobilised their troops, Holkar "retired to Mālwa with the real design of being guided by the issue of events" and took the field when it was too late, and the Gāikwār remained neutral.

Hostilities commenced early in the month of August, 1803. The total strength of the Marātha armies was 250,000 besides 40,000 troops trained by Frenchmen, while the British troops in different parts of India numbered about 55,000. But Wellesley was adequately prepared for the coming war. His measures in Mysore and at Surāt, his treaties with the Gāikwār and Oudh, and, above all, the Treaty of Bassein "afforded the most efficient means of opposing the confederacy with success". The English decided to attack the enemy at all points, and the war was conducted in two main centres, in the Deccan under Arthur Wellesley and in Hindustān under General Lake—and simultaneously in three subsidiary centres in Gujarāt, Bundelkhand and Orissa. The French-trained battalions of the Marāthas did not prove very useful, and the European officers in Sindhia's army mostly deserted him. The Marāthas had certainly committed a mistake in abandoning the harassing tactics of their predecessors and in giving preference to Western methods of fighting for which they had to depend on foreigners. It resulted in quick reverses.

In the Deccan, Arthur Wellesley captured Ahmadnagar, on the Nizām's frontier, on the 12th August, 1803, and on the 23rd September gained a complete victory over the combined troops of Sindhia and Bhonsle at Assaye, situated about forty-five miles north of Aurangābād. Grant Duff described this battle as "a triumph more splendid than any recorded in Deccan history". Burhānpur and Asīrgarh were captured by the English on the 15th October and 21st October respectively. The Bhonsle Rājā's forces were completely defeated at Argāon, about fifty miles east of Burhānpur, on the 29th November, and the English captured the strong fortress of Gāwilgarh on the 15th December, 1803. In Hindustān, also, success attended British arms. Lake captured Delhi and Āgra, and the northern army of the Sindhia was severely routed at the battle of Delhi in the month of September and at Laswarī, in Alwar State, in the month of November. The English gained further successes in Gujarāt, Bundelkhand and Orissa. Thus, in the course of five months, Sindhia and Bhonsle had to own severe defeats and conclude two separate treaties

with the English. By the Treaty of Deogāon, concluded on the 17th December, 1803, the Bhonsle Rājā of Berār ceded to the English the province of Cuttack, including Balāsore, and the whole of his



From V. A. Smith: *The Oxford History of India* (Clarendon Press)

territory west of the river Warda. The English were henceforth to arbitrate if he had any disputes with the Nizām or the Peshwā: and "no European or American or a nation at war with the English

or any British subject, was to be entertained without the consent of the British Government". On his agreeing to maintain a British Resident at Nāgpur, the Honourable M. Elphinstone was sent there. Sindhia concluded the Treaty of Surji-Arjangāon on the 30th December, by which he gave to the victors all his territories between the Ganges and the Jumnā and his forts and territories to the north of the Rājput principalities of Jaipur, Jodhpur and Gohad. To the westward he ceded to them Ahmadnagar, Broach and all his territories west of the Ajantā Hills. He renounced all his claims on the Mughul Emperor, the Peshwā, the Nizām and on the British Government; agreed not to admit into his service Europeans of enemy countries or British subjects without the consent of the English; and Sir John Malcolm was appointed Resident at his court. By another treaty, concluded on the 27th February, 1804, he entered into a subsidiary alliance, according to which a defence force of 6,000 infantry was to be stationed not in Sindhia's territory, but near its frontier. As a reward for his loyalty to the English, the Nizām got, from the old possessions of the Rājā of Berār, all territories to the south of Narnulla and Gāwilgarh and west of the river Warda, and, from the dominions of Sindhia, districts south of the Ajantā Hills such as Jalnāpur and Gondāpur.

As a result of the Second Anglo-Marātha War, the English secured important advantages in various ways. "With all the sanguine temper of my mind," confessed Wellesley, "I declare that I could not have hoped for a completion of my plans at once so rapid and so secure." The British possessions in Madras and Bengal were linked up and were expanded also in other directions. The titular Mughul Emperor, Ṣhāh 'Ālam II, came under their protection and treaties of alliance were concluded with the States of Jodhpur, Jaipur, Macheri, Bundi and the Jāt kingdom of Bharatpur. The French-trained battalions in the service of the Marāthas were removed. The Nizām and the Peshwā fell more under their influence than before. Munro, a critical writer, asserted: "We are now complete masters of India, and nothing can shake our power, if we take proper measures to confirm it." But Wellesley showed an "almost wilful" error of judgment in believing that the treaties afforded the "only possible security for the permanent tranquillity and prosperity of these valuable and important possessions". The Ministry in England, as is clear from the contemporary despatches of Lord Castlereagh, thought otherwise. The situation in India was rightly diagnosed by Arthur Wellesley, who thought that his brother, the Governor-General, put "a too exacting interpretation on the Treaties of Peace". He wrote

on the 13th May, 1804: "Our enemies are much disgusted, and complain loudly of our conduct and want of faith; and in truth I consider the peace to be by no means secured."

B. War With Holkar

In fact, the peace had already come to an end with the commencement of hostilities (April, 1804) between Holkar, who had so long kept himself aloof from the war, and the English. Holkar pursued the old tactics of the Marāthas and defeated Colonel Monson, who had in an ill-judged manner advanced too far into the plains of Rājputāna, at Mukundarā Pass, thirty miles south of Kotah, and compelled him to retreat to Āgra towards the end of August. Flushed with this success, Holkar marched northward and besieged Delhi from the 8th to the 14th October, but the city was successfully defended by the local British Resident, Lt.-Colonel Ochterlony. A band of Holkar's troops was defeated at Dig on the 13th November and another band, personally commanded by Holkar, was routed by General Lake on the 17th November. But the English soon suffered a serious reverse owing to Lake's failure to take the fortress of Bharatpur early in 1805. The Rājā of Bharatpur, however, concluded a treaty with the English on the 10th April, 1805, and the war might have taken an adverse turn for Holkar but for Wellesley's sudden recall.

For some time past the authorities in England had been rather dissatisfied with the aggressive policy of Wellesley, and his conquests, though brilliant and of far-reaching consequence, "were becoming", it was believed by many, "too large for profitable management" and raised the Company's debts from seventeen millions in 1797 to thirty-one millions in 1806. Further, Wellesley's manners were imperious and overbearing, and he dealt with the home authorities in a rather masterful way, often disregarding their orders and instructions and not informing them of his actions. So long as Wellesley's policy was crowned with success, the home authorities did not interfere. But the news of the disastrous retreat of Monson and the failure of Lake before Bharatpur having reached England, his "war-loving" policy began to be severely condemned by a strong public opinion. Pitt is said to have declared that Wellesley "had acted most imprudently and illegally, and that he could not be suffered to remain in the government". Lord Wellesley resigned his post and sailed for England.

Lord Cornwallis being appointed Governor-General for the second

time at the age of sixty-seven reached Calcutta on the 30th July, 1805, with instructions from Castlereagh to stop aggrandisement and "to bring back things to the state which the legislature had prescribed" by the Acts of 1784 and 1793. But, before anything could be done to reverse the subsidiary treaties, Lord Cornwallis died at Ghāzipur on the 5th October, 1805, and Sir George Barlow, the senior member of the Council, became the acting Governor-General. Barlow carried out the policy of his predecessor. Peace was finally concluded with the Sindhia on the 23rd November, 1805. Gwālior and Gohud were restored to him; he was to claim nothing north of the river Chambal and the Company nothing to the south of it; and the Company pledged itself not to enter into treaties with the chiefs of Rājputāna. Meanwhile Lord Lake had hunted Holkar up to Amritsar, where the latter had appealed to the Sikhs for help, who, however, did not accept his proposals. He thereupon opened negotiations with Lord Lake for peace, which was signed on the 7th January, 1806. Holkar gave up all claims to Tonk, Rāmpurā, Bundi, Kooch, Bundelkhand and places north of the Chambal, but he got back the greater part of his lost territories. Further, in spite of strong protest from Lord Lake, Sir George Barlow published Declaratory Articles whereby Tonk and Rāmpurā were practically surrendered to Holkar and British protection was withdrawn from the other Rājput States. Thus the Rājput States were left to their fate, to be distracted by Marātha inroads into their territories. As an envoy of the Rājā of Jaipur observed, the Company now made "its faith subservient to its convenience".

C. The Third Anglo-Marātha War and the Fall of the Marāthas

With the last quarter of the eighteenth century the Marāthas had begun losing all those elements which are needed for the growth of a power, and so could not profit in the least by the British policy of neutrality in the beginning of the nineteenth century. The political and administrative conditions of all the Marātha States came to be hopelessly confused and gloomy, and their economic condition anything but satisfactory. Jaswant Rāo Holkar secretly assassinated his brother, Kāsī Rāo, and his nephew, Khande Rāo. The course of events, however, so affected his mind that he became insane, and died on the 20th October, 1811. The real ruler was now the deceased Holkar's favourite mistress, Tulsī Bāī, a clever and intelligent woman, who had the support of Balarām Seth, Jaswant Rāo's minister, and of Amīr

Khān, the leader of the Central Indian Pathāns. These unworthy men failed to administer the State properly.

So far as Daulat Rāo Sindhia was concerned, the financial resources of his State could not suffice to meet the cost of his army, and his soldiers were permitted to collect money on their own account from the districts. The morale of the army thereby deteriorated and Sindhia could not maintain a strong control over his generals.

Exposed to the inroads of the Pindarīs and the Pathāns, the territory of Raghūjī Bhonsle was in the midst of disorder. So none of the three Marātha chiefs were in a position to oppose the English openly; and the Gāikwār of Barodā manifested no desire to violate the treaty of subsidiary alliance into which he had entered on the 21st April, 1805. Referring to the Marātha princes Prinsep believed that "as far as they were individually concerned, the objects of the settlement of 1805–1806 seem to have been attained; their weakness afforded a security against any one of them meditating a separate hostile enterprise; at the same time the balance that had been established remained unaltered, and the mutual jealousies relied upon as the guarantee against a second coalition were yet unextinguished".

But another trial of strength between the English and the Marāthas took place before the latter finally succumbed. Though apparently friendly, the Marātha chiefs, including even the Peshwā, who had been restored to the *masnad* through the help of the English, nurtured in their heart of hearts feelings of jealousy and hostility against the English, which they could not then openly manifest owing to the distracted condition of their kingdoms, but which might burst forth on the appearance of a favourable opportunity. Largely under the influence of his unscrupulous favourite, Trimbakjī Danglia, Bājī Rāo II engaged in intrigues with a view to leading once more a confederacy of the Marātha chiefs against the English. To settle some disputes between the Peshwā and the Gāikwār, the latter sent to Poona in A.D. 1814 his chief minister, Gangādhar Shāstrī, a friend of the English. Shāstrī was conducted by the Peshwā to Nāsik and was murdered there apparently at the instigation of Trimbakjī. After a good deal of hesitation, Bājī Rāo II surrendered Trimbakjī to Mountstuart Elphinstone, the British Resident at Poona since 1811, who placed him under confinement in the fortress of Thana. But he escaped a year later, it was believed with the connivance of the Peshwā, though there is no definite proof of it. Matters became most threatening by the year 1817. The Peshwā now made serious attempts to organise against the English a confederacy of

the Marātha chiefs and opened negotiations with them as well as with the Pathān chief, Amīr Khān, and the Pindarīs. He also tried to increase the strength and efficiency of his army.

The English did not fail to take prompt measures to check the Peshwā's designs. With the arrival of the Earl of Moira, better known as the Marquess of Hastings (1813–1823), the British policy of neutrality had been thoroughly reversed. The new Governor-General was determined "to render the British Government paramount in effect, if not declaredly so" and to "hold the other States vassals in substance, if not in name. . . ." Mountstuart Elphinstone, instructed by the Governor-General on the 10th May, 1817, to circumscribe the powers of the Peshwā in such a way as to "prevent the evils apprehended from the course of policy pursued by the Court of Poona for several years", induced Bājī Rāo II to sign most reluctantly the Treaty of Poona on the 13th June, 1817 The Peshwā had to renounce the headship of the Marātha confederacy; to commute his claims on the Gāikwār to four lacs of rupees and to promise not to make further demands on him: and to surrender to the English the Konkan and some important strongholds. Daulat Rāo Sindhia was also compelled by the English to sign the Treaty of Gwālior on the 5th November, 1817, by which he bound himself to co-operate with the English to suppress the Pindarīs and gave the Company full liberty to enter into engagements with the States beyond the Chambal. Thus the English could conclude a number of treaties with the Rājput States, so long greatly harassed by Marātha inroads. Meanwhile, internal quarrels about the succession to the kingdom of Nāgpur had given an opportunity to the English to bring that kingdom under their influence. Raghūjī Bhonsle II died on the 22nd March, 1816, and was succeeded by his imbecile son, Parsojī. Parsojī had an able but ambitious cousin, Appa Sāheb, who aspired to the government and wanted as a preparatory measure to secure the regency. The English recognised this on his signing a treaty of subsidiary alliance on the 27th May, 1816. The Treaties of Poona, Gwālior, and Nāgpur added greatly to the influence of the English at the cost of the Marāthas. The first dealt a severe blow at the power and prestige of the Peshwā; the second checked the pretensions of Sindhia over the Rājput States, which fell under British control; and the third cost the Nāgpur State its independence and brought it under the subsidiary system, which had been evaded by Raghūjī Bhonsle II but had been "so long and so earnestly desired by the British Government". The "defensive means" of the English were now greatly improved, and Malcolm observes

that "in the actual condition of India no event could be more fortunate than the subsidiary alliance with Nāgpur".

But none of the Marātha chiefs were sincerely reconciled to the loss of their independence and they had full sympathy with the Peshwā's desire to make himself free from British control. On the very day that Sindhia signed the subsidiary treaty, the Peshwā sacked and burnt the British Residency at Poona and attacked with about 27,000 men a small British army of 2,800 under Colonel Burr at Khirki; but he was completely defeated. Appa Sāheb of Nāgpur and Malhar Rāo Holkar II, son of Jaswant Rāo Holkar, rose in arms against the English. The Nāgpur troops were defeated at Sitābaldi on the 27th November, 1817, and Holkar's forces were routed at Mahidpur by Hislop on the 21st December, 1817. Appa Sāheb fled to the Punjab and then to Jodhpur where he died in A.D. 1840. The districts lying to the north of the Narmadā were annexed to British territories and a minor grandson of Raghūjī Bhonsle II was established as Rājā over the remnant of the state. Holkar was forced to sign the Treaty of Mandasor on the 6th January, 1818, by which he gave up all claims on the Rājput States, ceded to the English all districts south of the Narmadā, agreed to maintain a subsidiary force within this territory, submitted his foreign relations to the arbitration of the British, and recognised Amīr Khān, a mercenary commander, as Nawāb of Tonk. A permanent British Resident was henceforth stationed at Indore.

As for the Peshwā, after his defeat at Khirki, he fought two more battles with the English—at Koregāon on the 1st January, 1818, and at Ashti on the 20th February, 1818. He was defeated in both, his able general Gokhale being killed in the second. Bājī Rāo II at last surrendered to Sir John Malcolm on the 3rd June, 1818. The Peshwāship, which served as the symbol of national unity among the Marāthas even in its worst days, was abolished; Bājī Rāo II was allowed to spend his last days at Bithur near Cawnpore on a pension of eight lacs a year; his dominions were placed under British control; and "British influence and authority spread over the land with magical celerity". Trimbakjī was kept in life-long confinement in the fort of Chunār. The small kingdom of Sātārā, formed out of the Peshwā's dominions, was given to Pratāp Simha a lineal descendant of Shivājī and the formal head of the Marātha Empire. The State of Sātārā did not become the centre of a hostile Marātha confederacy, as Thornton apprehended. As a matter of fact, as Roberts records, "the rule of the new dynasty proved an evil and incompetent one, and Sātārā was one of the States to which subsequently the Doctrine of Lapse was applied by Dalhousie"

D. Causes of the Downfall of the Marāthas

Thus was foiled the last attempt of the Marāthas to build up their political supremacy in India on the ruins of the Mughul Empire. The fabric of the Marātha Empire, which the genius and military ability of Shivājī the Great had brought into existence, and which, after a short period of decline, was revived by Bājī Rāo I, and competed with the English for political supremacy for about forty years, now collapsed most ignominiously. This was primarily due to certain inherent defects in the character of the Marātha State, particularly during the eighteenth century, though there were other factors which accelerated it. In the Marātha State, "there was", Sir J. N. Sarkar asserts, "no attempt at well-thought-out organised communal improvement, spread of education, or unification of the people, either under Shivājī or under the Peshwās. The cohesion of the peoples of the Marātha State was not organic but artificial, accidental and therefore precarious". Another drawback of the Marātha State was its lack of a sound economic policy and satisfactory financial arrangements, without which the political development of a nation becomes impossible. The sterile soil of Mahārāshtra held out no prospects for flourishing agriculture, trade and industries, and the Marātha State had to depend on uncertain and precarious sources of income like *chauth*, which again cost them the sincere co-operation of the other indigenous powers. Further, the revival of the *jāgīr* system after the death of Shivājī introduced a highly disintegrating force into the State; the Marātha *jāgīrdārs*, blind to all but their personal interests, ruined the national cause by plunging their country into intrigues and quarrels. With some exceptions like Shivājī, Bājī Rāo I, Mādhava Rāo I, Malhār Rāo Holkar, Mahādājī Sindhia and Nānā Fadnavis, the Marātha chiefs, particularly those of later times, indulged more in finesse or intrigue than well-calculated statesmanlike action, which produced a disastrous reaction on the destiny of their State, especially when they were confronted with superior British diplomacy during the close of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth. Lastly, the Marāthas of the eighteenth century, while discarding their old tactics of war, could not develop, even under Mahādājī Sindhia and Nānā Fadnavis, a military system organised on the scientific lines of the West. Opposed to them were the English, possessed of an efficient military organisation, based on up-to-date methods and varied experience of European wars. It is indeed a pity that the Marāthas depended upon foreign adventurers "for

a most vital means of self-protection", and thus ultimately lost their independence.

2. Anglo-Mysore Relations

A. The Fourth Anglo-Mysore War

Lord Cornwallis optimistically estimated the results of the war with Tipu in his time by saying: "We have effectively crippled our enemy, without making our friends too formidable."

But the hope of a lasting peace was soon belied. A man like Tipu could never accept for long the humiliation that he had

E. M. A.

FORT OF SERINGAPATAM, SHOWING THE SALLY-PORT GATE, WHERE TIPU SULTĀN WAS KILLED

suffered at the hands of the English, against whom he nursed a deep resentment. "Instead of sinking under his misfortunes, he exerted," writes Malcolm, "all his activity to repair the ravages of war. He began to add to the fortifications of his capital—to remount his cavalry—to recruit and discipline his infantry—to punish his refractory tributaries, and to encourage the cultivation of his country, which was soon restored to its former prosperity." France was then involved in a deadly war with England in Europe; and as an astute diplomat, Tipu tried to secure the alliance of France against the English in India. He enlisted himself

as a member of the Jacobin Club and permitted nine Frenchmen in his service to elect "citizen Ripaud", a Lieutenant in the French navy, as their President, to hoist the flag of the recently established French Republic and to plant a Tree of Liberty at Seringapatam. With a view to securing allies for himself in the contemplated conflict, Tipu also sent emissaries to Arabia, Kābul, Constantinople, Versailles and Mauritius. The French governor of the Isle of France, Monsieur Malartic, welcomed the envoys and proposals of Tipu, and published a proclamation inviting volunteers to come forward to help Tipu in expelling the English from India. As a result of this, some Frenchmen landed at Mangalore in April, 1798.

Lord Wellesley on his arrival at Madras on the 26th April, 1798, quickly realised the hostile intentions of Tipu and at once determined to wage war on him, overruling the timid suggestions of the Madras Council. He held in his Minute of 12th August, 1798, that "the act of Tippo's ambassadors, ratified by himself, and accompanied by the landing of a French force in his country is a public, unqualified and unambiguous declaration of war; aggravated by an avowal, that the object of the war is neither expansion, reparation, nor security, but the total destruction of the British Government in India. To attempt to misunderstand an insult and injury of such a complexion would argue a consciousness either of weakness or of fear." Besides other preparations for the war, Wellesley tried to revive the Triple Alliance of 1790. The Nizām at once concluded a subsidiary alliance with the English on the 1st September, 1798, but the Marāthas gave rather vague replies to the Governor-General's overtures. Nevertheless, to show the "disinterestedness of the British Government to every branch of the Triple Alliance", Wellesley engaged to give the Peshwā a share in the conquests of the war.

This war against Tipu was of a very short duration, but quite decisive. He was defeated by Stuart at Sedaseer, forty-five miles west of Seringapatam, on the 5th March, 1799, and again on the 27th March by General Harris at Malvelly, thirty miles east of Seringapatam. Tipu then retired to Seringapatam, which was captured by the English on the 4th May. The Mysore Sultān died while gallantly defending his metropolis, which was, however, plundered by the English troops. Thus fell a leading Indian power and one of the most inveterate and dreadful foes of the English.

Mysore was at the disposal of the English. The members of Tipu's family were interned at Vellore. They were suspected of being involved in the abortive mutiny of the sepoys at Vellore

THE PARTITION OF MYSORE

From Roberts: *India under Wellesley* (G. Bell & Sons Ltd.)

in 1806 and were deported to Calcutta. As a sort of diplomatic move, Wellesley offered the districts of Soonda and Harponelly, lying in the north-west of the Mysore kingdom, to the Marāthas, who, however, refused to accept these. To the Nizām was given

the territory to the north-east near his dominion, that is, the districts of Gooty and Gurramkonda and a part of the district of Chiteldrug except its fort. The English took for themselves Kanara on the west; Wynaad in the south-east, the districts of Coimbatore and Daraporam; two tracts on the east; and the town and island of Seringapatam. A boy of the old Hindu reigning dynasty of Mysore was given the rest of the kingdom. This new State of Mysore became virtually a dependency of the English. A subsidiary treaty, which the minor ruler had to accept, provided for the maintenance of a protecting British force within the kingdom. A subsidy was to be paid by its ruler which could be increased by the Governor-General in time of war; and the Governor-General was further empowered to take over the entire internal administration of the country if he was dissatisfied on any account with its government. This arrangement, Wellesley hoped, would enable him "to command the whole resources of the Rājā's territory". The Governor-General "acted wisely", in Thornton's opinion, "in not making Mysore ostensibly a British possession. He acted no less wisely in making it substantially so". Because of misgovernment, Lord William Bentinck brought Mysore under the direct administration of the Company, and it remained so till 1881, when Lord Ripon restored the royal family to power.

The settlement of Mysore, as effected by Lord Wellesley, secured for the Company substantial territorial, economic, commercial and military advantages. It extended the Company's dominion "from sea to sea across the base of the peninsula", encompassing the new kingdom of Mysore on all sides except in the north. When in 1800 the Nizām transferred his acquisitions from Mysore to the Company, this kingdom "was entirely encircled by the Pax Britannica". This achievement of the Governor-General was enthusiastically applauded in England; he was elevated to the rank of Marquis in the peerage of Ireland and General Harris was made a baron.

B. Estimate of Tipu

Tipu is, in many respects, a remarkable personality in Indian history. A man of sound moral character, free from the prevailing vices of his class, he had an intense faith in God. He was fairly well educated, could speak fluently Persian, Kanarese and Urdu, and had a valuable library. A valiant soldier and a tactful general, Tipu was a diplomat of no mean order. This is proved by his clear perception of the fact that England and not any Indian power was the enemy; by his study of politics, particularly

the relations between England and France in Europe; by the embassies he sent to France and other places; and the correspondence that he carried on with Zamān Shāh of Kābul. He placed independence above everything else, and lost his life in trying to preserve it. Unlike many of his Indian contemporaries, Tipu was an able and industrious ruler. Some of his English contemporaries, like Edward Moore and Major Dirom, were favourably impressed with his administration and have unhesitatingly stated that he enjoyed sufficient popularity in his kingdom. Even Sir John Shore observes that "the peasantry of his dominions are protected and their labours encouraged and rewarded". Some writers, old[1] as well as modern,[2] have wrongly described Tipu as a cruel and sanguinary tyrant, an oppressive despot, and a furious fanatic. He cannot be held guilty of systematic cruelty, and, as Major Dirom remarks, "his cruelties were in general inflicted only on those whom he considered as his enemies". Also he was not a fierce bigot. The discovery and study of Tipu's Shringherī Letters prove that he knew "how to placate Hindu opinion, and religious intolerance was not the cause of his ruin". Though a pious Muslim, he did not attempt any wholesale conversion of his Hindu subjects, as Wilks' account would lead us to believe; but he forced it only on those recalcitrant Hindus on whose allegiance he could not rely. In one respect, he compares unfavourably with his father; politically he was less sagacious and practical than the latter. He often tried to introduce useless innovations in the name of reform. "A restless spirit of innovation, and a wish to have everything to originate from himself, was," wrote Thomas Munro, "the predominant feature of his character."

3. Disappearance of the French Menace

The fall of Tipu was a source of immense relief to the English, who were much worried by French intrigues. Tipu was indeed, as the Governor-General's brother, the Duke of Wellington, observed, "the certain ally of the French in India". As a matter of fact, the battle of Wandīwāsh did not finally shatter the ambitions of the French in India. There still remained a French peril throughout the rest of the eighteenth century. The French now tried to pursue their ambitious designs by establishing their influence in the courts of Indian powers like the Nizām, the Sultān of Mysore and the Marāthas. They joined their

[1] Kirkpatrick, Wilks, Rennell and others.
[2] Bowring, Roberts and Dean Hutton.

armies, and incited them against the English. Chevalier, Governor of Chandernagore from 1767 to 1778, and Governors of Pondicherry, Law de Lauriston (1765–1776), Bellecombe (1777–1778), and military adventurers like Madec, Modave and Gentil, who were in the service of the Indian Princes, and St. Lubin and Montigny, two agents sent by the Minister of Marine and Colonies, formed certain diplomatic projects which could not be carried into effect fully for various reasons. In 1777 St. Lubin negotiated a treaty with Nānā Fadnavis with a view to stirring up the Marāthas against the English, and the French considered an alliance with Hyder 'Ālī to be necessary "for regaining the ascendancy which they have lost in India and to despoil their rival of it". Disgusted by English neutrality at the battle of Kharda, the Nizām sought French help, and maintained a trained body of 14,000 men under a French commander, named François Raymond, who had organised a definitely "anti-British, pro-French and pro-Tipu" party in the Hyderābād court. Daulat Rāo Sindhia also maintained in his northern armies 40,000 disciplined men under Perron, a French general, whose influence over the Sindhia was so great that Wellesley could without much exaggeration say that he had built a French State on the banks of the Jumnā. We have already noted the nature of Franco-Mysore relations, which were undoubtedly antagonistic to English interests.

The French further tried to utilise the opportunities afforded by wars in America and Europe to regain what they had lost in India. Thus when the War of American Independence broke out, besides allying themselves with the revolted colonies, they sent, in 1782, three thousand men under Bussy and a fleet under Admiral Suffren to help Hyder 'Ālī; but Bussy's expedition was unable to further French interests. Again Hyder's son sought the French alliance when England was engaged in a deadly war with revolutionary France. Though on the outbreak of the Revolutionary Wars the French possessions in India were seized by the English, the Egyptian campaign of Napoleon, and the projects of the French to establish their influence in Egypt and then undermine the British position in India, were sources of deep anxiety to the English officers in India.

It did not take a long time for Wellesley, who possessed penetrating insight and a clear vision, to realise the nature of the French peril. He took immediate steps to remove it. Besides trying to destroy French influence in Indian courts and armies and disbanding the European-trained armies of the Nizām, he planned expeditions against the Isle of France, as from the beginning of the Revolutionary Wars French privateers used it as a

base to prey upon English shipping in the Indian Ocean; but they could not be carried into effect owing to the refusal of Admiral Rainier, commander of the British squadron, to co-operate with him. He also contemplated the capture of Batavia, the capital of the Dutch East Indies. In response to an order from home, he sent an expedition to the Red Sea under the command of Sir David Baird in 1801. The French at Alexandria had already capitulated before Baird's party reached Cairo. Wellesley did not restore to the French their settlements in India after the Peace of Amiens, which was but a temporary truce of thirteen months.

The French still persisted in their anti-English intrigues in India. Decaen, the newly-appointed Captain-General of the French in India, tried fruitlessly to secure Indian allies and also encouraged French privateers to capture British vessels in the Indian seas. The English were, however, finally freed from the French menace by the year 1814–1815. This synchronised with the attempt of Lord Hastings to establish British paramountcy in India.

4. Hyderābād

We have seen that after his defeat at Kharda, the Nizām in utter disgust turned to the French for support and freely admitted Frenchmen into his court and army. When Lord Wellesley arrived in India, Frenchmen "of the most virulent principles of Jacobinism", as Wellesley himself said, dominated the Nizām.

But Wellesley was determined to exterminate French influence and intrigues in India and to extend British control over the Indian powers. Circumstances favoured his policy. The Nizām had been somewhat pacified by British assistance given him during the rebellion of his son 'Ālī Jāh in 1797; he had by this time become suspicious of the growing French influence; and his minister Mīr Ālam, a friend of the English, had been urging him to form an amicable settlement with the English. Wellesley's first step was to persuade the Nizām to conclude a subsidiary treaty on the 1st September, 1798, which provided for the maintenance and payment of a force of six battalions by the Nizām, the subordination of his external relations to the control of the English, and the expulsion of European officers belonging to other nationalities from his territory. The French-trained troops of the Nizām were disbanded by Malcolm and Kirkpatrick, and he proved to be a sincere ally of the Company in its war against Tipu, for which, as we have already noted, he was rewarded with portions of the Mysore kingdom. As the treaty of 1798 was of a temporary nature,

a "perpetual and general defensive alliance" was formed between the English and the Nizām on the 12th October, 1800, whereby the subsidiary force was increased, for the maintenance of which the Nizām surrendered to the English all the territories he had got as spoils of the Mysore Wars in 1792 and 1798. He also agreed not to enter into political relations with other powers without the permission of the English. Nizām 'Ālī died in 1803, and his successor, Sikandar Jāh, had no hesitation in confirming all the previous treaties with the English. By a treaty concluded in the time of Lord Hastings, on the 12th December, 1822, readjustment of territories was effected, and the Nizām was exempted from the payment of arrears of tribute to the Peshwā.

The subsidiary alliance guaranteed protection to the Hyderābād State against external aggression; but it produced some disastrous consequences in its internal administration. As a natural sequel to the habit of dependence on another power, the Hyderābād rulers of this period lost all initiative for good and efficient government, and their country became subject to various disruptive forces, as was also the case with many other provinces of contemporary India, like Bengal, Oudh and the Carnatic, while the kingdom of Tipu, who was not a subsidiary ruler, was in a flourishing condition. "Conceive of a country," observed the Duke of Wellington, "in every village of which there are from twenty to thirty horsemen, who have been dismissed from the service of the State, and who have no means of living except by plunder. In this country there is no law, no civil government . . . no inhabitant can, or will, remain to cultivate, unless he is protected by an armed force stationed in the village. This is the outline of the state of the countries of the Peshwā and the Nizām."

5. The Carnatic

The existence of dual government in the Carnatic, no less disastrous and oppressive to its people than the dual government of Bengal, could certainly not be tolerated by Lord Wellesley, a man of strong determination and highly imperialistic instincts. To bring the Carnatic under the supreme control of the Company by cutting out this "festering sore" seemed to him to be an almost imperative need for the extension of his favourite principle, which he thus enunciated later on: "The Company with relation to its territory in India must be viewed in the capacity of a sovereign power." But "the method he employed was unfortunate and laid him open to the charge of sophistical dealing". Certain documents discovered

at Seringapatam proved, according to the Governor-General, that both Muhammad 'Ālī and Omdut-ul-Umarā, who died on the 15th July, 1801, carried on secret and treasonable correspondence with Tipu Sultān. He declared that they had thus "placed themselves in the condition of public enemies" and had forfeited their right to the throne of the Carnatic. He ignored the claim of 'Ālī Husain, son of the deceased Nawāb, to his father's territory, and on the 25th July, 1801, concluded a treaty with 'Āzīm-ud-daulah, a nephew of Omdut-ul-Umarā, who was thereby installed as the nominal Nawāb of the Carnatic. He was guaranteed a pension of one-fifth of its revenues, and the entire civil and military administration of the province was taken over by the Company. The assumption of the Carnatic government was declared by Wellesley as "perhaps the most salutary and useful measure which has been adopted since the acquisition of the *Dewanny* (*Diwānī*) of Bengal"; and writers like Thornton, Owen, and some others, have tried to vindicate his policy in every way. But it earned Mill's severe criticism. The documents in question did not prove the treachery of the Carnatic Nawābs. Wellesley could have frankly declared what his object was, and could have given effect to it in a more straightforward manner.

6. Tanjore and Surāt

The rulers of Tanjore and Surāt were also compelled by Wellesley to surrender their administrative powers to the Company, and to remain content with "empty titles" and "guaranteed pensions". As for Tanjore, a Marātha principality founded by Shivājī's father, Shāhjī, a disputed succession gave Wellesley an opportunity to intervene in its affairs and thus persuade its ruler to conclude a subsidiary treaty on the 25th October, 1799. By this treaty the whole civil and military administration of this kingdom passed to the Company in return for a pension of £40,000 per annum. A similar fate befell the principality of Surāt. Since 1759 the Company had undertaken its defence on behalf of the Mughul Emperor, while its Nawāb retained the civil administration. But the Nawābs of Surāt were unable to pay all the sums required by the Company for the expenses of the garrison it maintained in that State. When the old Nawāb of Surāt died on the 8th January, 1799, Lord Wellesley, in a high-handed manner, forced his brother and legitimate successor, to surrender the whole administration of the territory to the Company in March, 1800. Thus Wellesley committed, in the opinion of Mill, "the most unceremonious act of dethronement

which the English had yet performed, as the victim was the weakest and most obscure". Beveridge unhesitatingly declares that "the whole proceeding was characterised by tyranny and injustice".

7. The Fate of Oudh

Loss of independence was the price which the kingdom of Oudh paid for her long-continued internal bankruptcy, in the time of Wellesley. The Governor-General was convinced that, for the effective security of the north-western frontier, Oudh must be brought definitely under British control. In his private letter to John Lumsden, the Company's Resident at Oudh, he expressed his determination to take possession of the Doāb with a view to strengthening the Company's north-western frontier; to substitute for the Nawāb's troops "an increased number of the Company's regiments of infantry and cavalry, to be relieved from time to time and to be paid by His Excellency (the Nawāb); and to dislodge from Oudh every European excepting the Company's servants". The immediate execution of these projects was obstructed by an unfortunate incident at Benares, where, on the 14th January, 1799, Wāzīr 'Alī, bitterly resentful of his position, massacred several Englishmen, including Mr. Cherry, the British Resident. He was in fact trying to organise a widespread conspiracy against the Company, had confederates in Bihār and Bengal, and even sought to secure the help of Zamān Shāh of Kābul, who threatened an invasion of Hindustān. But he was captured by a British force and sent to Fort William, where he spent his days in confinement till his death in A.D. 1817.

It was not possible for Wellesley to charge the Nawāb of Oudh, who had all along been faithful to the Company, with treason or insubordination, as he had done in the case of the ruler of the Carnatic. But he had a convenient pretext, in the threat of Zamān Shāh to invade Hindustān, for demanding from the Nawāb of Oudh the disbandment of his own army and the increase of the Company's forces. After some resistance, the Nawāb, under pressure from the British Resident, Colonel Scott, announced his intention to abdicate. Considering this proposal to be an excellent means for the establishment of "the sole and exclusive authority of the Company within the province of Oudh and its dependencies", the Governor-General wrote to the Court of Directors that it was his intention "to profit by the event to the utmost practicable extent". But when Wellesley sought to exclude the Nawāb's sons from succession to the *masnad* of Oudh, the Nawāb withdrew h

announcement of abdication. This made the Governor-General furious. He declared himself "extremely disgusted at the duplicity and insincerity which mark the conduct of the Nawāb-Vazir on the present occasion", and now presented to the Nawāb a draft treaty which considerably increased the number of Company's troops and the amount of the subsidy that was to be paid. The Nawāb advanced some reasonable objections on the strength of former treaties; but Wellesley rejected these and forced him to submit to his demands. This was not enough to satisfy the Governor-General. He again compelled the Nawāb to conclude a treaty on the 10th November, 1801, by which the latter had to surrender the rich and valuable tracts of Rohilkhand and the Lower Doāb, that is, the territories lying between the Ganges and the Jumnā, covering almost half of his dominions. Thus Oudh was encircled by British territory except on the north; and the British possessions now confronted Sindhia along the entire line of his dominions in Northern India. These were indeed advantages of great importance for the Company. "The rectification of our military frontier, and the territorial isolation of the Nabob (Nawāb)," as Owen rightly says, "were not only parts of a larger scheme, but in themselves measures of obvious importance, especially at such a crisis."

Wellesley's treatment of Oudh has been condemned not only by Mill but also by most of the other historians. Even Dr. H. H. Wilson admits that the negotiations with the Nawāb were carried on in an objectionable manner. Sir Alfred Lyall, not indeed always a hostile critic of Wellesley, considers that, in his dealings with Oudh, Wellesley "subordinated the feelings and interests of his ally to paramount considerations of British policy in a manner that showed very little patience, forbearance, or generosity". The Court of Directors also condemned it. British intervention did not at once bring peace and good government to the kingdom. The evils of administration were aggravated here, as in the other States which had accepted subsidiary alliances, till the kingdom was annexed subsequently on the charge of misgovernment. It may be said that the subsidiary treaties of Wellesley in a sense prepared the ground for Dalhousie's annexations in certain cases.

8. Anglo-Gurkhā Relations and the Nepāl War (1814–1816)

Taking advantage of internal struggles among the old ruling clans of the Nepāl valley, the Gurkhās, a tribe of the Western Himālayas, conquered it in A.D. 1768. They gradually built up

a powerful State possessing considerable military strength and naturally seeking outlets for expansion. Their attempts at a northern push being checked by the great Chinese Empire, they advanced towards the south, and during the early nineteenth century they extended their dominion as far as the River Tista on the east and the Sutlej on the west, so that they were then "in actual possession of the whole of the strong country which skirts the northern frontier of Hindustān". With the occupation of the Gorakhpur district by the Company in 1801, the territories of the Gurkhās in the Tarāi became conterminous with the uncertain and ill-defined northern frontier of the British dominion, and the border districts became subject to the incessant inroads of the Gurkhās. Sir George Barlow remonstrated without any effect, and in the time of Lord Minto the Gurkhās conquered Butwal, lying north of what is now known as the Basti district, and Sheoraj, farther to the east. These were regained by the English without open hostilities. But the conflicting interests of the Gurkhās and the English made an appeal to arms inevitable.

An unprovoked attack by the Gurkhās on three police-stations in Butwal in the month of May, 1814, was followed in October by a declaration of war against them by the Governor-General, Lord Hastings. Lord Hastings himself planned the campaign. He decided to attack the enemy simultaneously at four different points along the entire line of the frontier from the Sutlej to the Kosi, and also tried "to corrupt the fidelity of the Nepālese Government". But to vanquish the hardy Nepālese did not prove to be a very easy task, on account of their peculiar tactics and brilliant qualities as soldiers, the lack of knowledge on the part of the British soldiers of the geographical difficulties of the mountainous region, and the incompetence of the British generals with the exception of Ochterlony. So the British campaign of 1814–1815 was attended with reverses. Major-Generals Marley and John Sullivan Wood, who were required to advance towards the Nepāl capital from Patna and Gorakhpur respectively, retreated after some unsuccessful attempts; General Gillespie lost his life through his "indiscreet daring" in assaulting the mountain-fortress of Kalanga; and Major-General Martindell was defeated before the stronghold of Jaitak. But these losses of the English were more than retrieved when Colonels Nicolls and Gardner captured Almora in Kumāon in April, 1815, and General Ochterlony compelled the brave Gurkhā leader, Amar Singh Thapa, to surrender the fort of Malaon on the 15th May, 1815. In view of the hopelessness of further resistance, the Gurkhās signed a treaty at Sagauli on the 28th November, 1815.

Under the influence of the war party in Nepāl, its Government hesitated to ratify the treaty and hostilities began again. Ochterlony, now in supreme command of the British troops, advanced within fifty miles of the capital of Nepāl and defeated the Nepālese at Makwanpur on the 28th February, 1816. This led the Nepāl Government to ratify the treaty early in March next. In accordance with this the Nepālese gave up their claims to places in the lowlands along their southern frontier, ceded to the English the districts of Garhwāl and Kumāon on the west of Nepāl, withdrew from Sikkim, and agreed to receive a British Resident at Katmandu. These were indeed important gains for the English. The north-west frontier of their dominions now reached the mountains. They obtained sites for important hill-stations and summer capitals like Simla, Mussoorie, Almora, Ranikhet, Landour and Naini Tāl; and also greater facilities for communications with the regions of Central Asia. The Nepāl Government has ever since remained true to its alliance with the English. By a treaty with the Rājā of Sikkim, dated the 10th February, 1817, a tract ceded by the Nepālese was given to him, and this created a barrier between the eastern frontier of Nepāl and Bhutān.

9. Suppression of the Pindarī and Pathān Hordes, and Extension of British Paramountcy over Rājputāna and Central India

While the principal Indian powers were falling one by one before the growing British supremacy, Central India remained steeped in utter confusion and anarchy due to the turbulence and nefarious activities of predatory hordes like the Pindarīs and the Pathāns. In Rājputāna it was also partly due to the feudal rivalries among its different states, and partly to the ravages associated with the Marātha penetration into it during the second half of the eighteenth century. The continuance of this state of things over a wide area could not be tolerated by the English at a time when they were trying to establish their paramountcy over India. So after the close of the Nepāl war, Lord Hastings turned to deal with these disturbed regions, particularly because the Pindarīs had recently carried their raids into British territory and were also enlisted as mercenaries in the armies of the hostile Marātha chiefs.

A. The Pindarī War

The Pindarīs[1] were a horde of cruel marauders, who from their headquarters in Central India ravaged and plundered the neighbouring regions as well as some distant areas. They were heard of towards the close of the seventeenth century during the Mughul-Marātha wars in the Deccan. The general political disorders of the eighteenth century led them to take to organised plundering and robbery as a profession, just as the failure of the Dual Government and the consequent disorders in Bengal led to the rise and prevalence of widespread dacoities in that province for the greater part of the second half of the eighteenth century. The Pindarīs were employed as auxiliary forces in the Marātha armies and enjoyed the protection of Marātha chiefs like Sindhia and Holkar. In 1794 Sindhia granted them some settlements in Mālwa near the Narmadā. We get an idea of their organisation from contemporary English writers. One of them, Sir John Malcolm, writes: "The Pindarries, who had risen, like masses of putrefaction in animal matter, out of the corruption of weak and expiring States, had fortunately none of those bonds of union which unite men in adversity. They had neither the tie of religion nor of national feeling. They were men of all lands and all religions. They had been brought together less by despair than by deeming the life of a plunderer, in the actual state of India, as one of small hazard, but great indulgence. . . . The Pindarries, when they came to a rich country, had neither the means nor inclination, like the Tartars, to whom also they have been compared, to settle and repose. Like swarms of locusts, acting from instinct, they destroyed and left waste whatever province they visited." They generally avoided pitched battles; and plunder was their principal object, for which they perpetrated horrible cruelties on all whom they could get hold of. "They avoid fighting," wrote Captain Sydenham in a memorandum on the Pindarīs drawn up in 1809, "for they come to plunder, not to fight." Under their powerful leaders, Hiru, Buran, Chitu, Wasil Muhammad and Karim Khān, they extended their depredations far and wide. In 1812 they harried the British districts of Mirzāpur and Shāhābād. During 1815–1816 they devastated the Nizām's dominions and early in 1816 wantonly plundered the Northern Sarkārs.

[1] "Many different conjectures have been offered as to the etymology of the term Pindarry. The most popular one among the natives is that they derived it from their dissolute habits leading them constantly to resort to the shops of the sellers of an intoxicating drink termed Pinda." (Malcolm, *Memoir of Central India*, Vol. I, p. 433.)

But Lord Hastings had by this time formed a strong determination to suppress them, for which he received in September, 1816, the sanction of the Court of Directors. He was shrewd enough to come to an understanding with the principal Indian powers, before he launched his operations for the final extermination of the Pindarīs towards the close of 1817. He effected careful and vigorous military preparations with a view to rounding them up from all sides—on the north and east from Bengal, on the west from Gujarāt and on the south from the Deccan. He assembled together a large army of 113,000 men and 300 guns and divided it into two parts—the northern force of four divisions being placed under his personal command and the Deccan force of five divisions under the command of Thomas Hislop, who had Sir John Malcolm as his principal lieutenant. By the end of 1817 the British troops succeeded in expelling the Pindarīs from Mālwa and across the Chambal, and by the close of January, 1818, they were practically exterminated. Karim Khān, one of their powerful leaders, surrendered to Sir John Malcolm on the 18th February, 1818, and was given the small estate of Gawshpur in the United Provinces. Wasil Muhammad, who had taken refuge with Sindhia, was handed over by the Marātha chief to the English and died while in captivity at Ghāzīpur. Chitu was chased from place to place until he was devoured by a tiger in a jungle near Asīrgarh. Thus Malcolm wrote about five years later: ". . . the Pindaries are so effectually destroyed that their name is almost forgotten." Most of the survivors "mingled with the rest of the population", and some became "active improving farmers".

B. Suppression of the Pathāns

Many Pathāns at this time took to the habits of a predatory horde like the Pindarīs. "They commanded," notes Prinsep, a contemporary writer, "forces of a different description from those of the Pindaree chiefs. . . . Indeed, the grand difference between the two classes was, that the Pathans were banded together for the purpose of preying on Governments and powerful chiefs: to this end their force moved about with the materials of regular battles and sieges, so as to work on the fears of princes and men in power, extorting contributions and other advantages from them, by such intimidation as an efficient army could only impress: while the object of the Pindarees was universal plunder". They became powerful under their leaders, Muhammad Shāh Khān and Amīr Khān, and served as military adventurers under

some of the Rājput and Marātha chiefs of the time. From about 1799 Amīr Khān became intimately associated with Holkar's government. Amīr Khān became more formidable when, after the death of Muhammad Shāh Khān in 1814, the latter's troops joined him; and his depredations and plunders were carried on with greater force. The Company's Government decided to detach this powerful Pathān chief from the other predatory bands, and, after some negotiations, persuaded him to come to terms on the 9th November, 1817. He was recognised as the Nawāb of Tonk by the English and also by Holkar. The suppression of the Pindarīs and the alliance with Amīr Khān relieved India of a terrible pest, subversive of political order, public peace and social tranquillity.

C. Extension of British Paramountcy over Rājputāna and Central India

The Governor-Generalship of Lord Hastings also witnessed the establishment of British influence over the Rājput States and some minor states of Central India. Rājputāna had indeed a tragic history in the eighteenth century. The lords of Rājasthān had generally speaking lost the heroism and chivalry of their ancestors; and their land, distracted by dynastic quarrels (particularly between Jaipur and Jodhpur) and pseudo-chivalry, became a prey to external aggressions of the Marāthas, the Pindarīs and the Pathāns. These inroads resulted in anarchy, plunder, economic ruin and moral degradation and "ended only with the total ruin and humiliation of this noble race (the Rājputs)". Utterly bankrupt, the historic land of Rājasthān readily acknowledged British supremacy at a time when the English had vanquished the leading Indian powers.

Rājput alliance had been a potential factor in the consolidation of Mughul rule in India; the Marāthas under the third Peshwā failed to utilise it for their *Hindu-Pād-Pādshāhī*; and its value was realised by Lord Hastings even when the Rājputs had become "a played-out race". The Governor-General was satisfied that an alliance with the Rājput States would give "immense strategic advantages for the Company's military and political positions in Central India", and would place at the disposal of the Company "the resources of the Rājput country, for defensive and offensive purposes, against the internal as well as external enemies of the Company". So with the sanction of the home authorities he opened negotiations with the following Rājput States, which, one by one, entered into treaties of "defensive

alliance, perpetual friendship, protection and subordinate co-operation" with the Company: the State of Kotah, then under the able guidance of Zalim Singh, on the 26th December, 1817; Udaipur on the 16th January, 1818, Bundi on the 10th February, 1818; Kishangarh, near Ajmer, and Bikāner, in March, 1818; Jaipur on the 2nd April, 1818; the three kingdoms of Pratāpgarh, Banswārā and Dungarpur, branches of the Udaipur house and situated on the border of Gujarāt, on the 5th October, 5th December, and 11th December, 1818, respectively; Jaisalmer on the 12th December, 1818; and Sirohi in 1823.

Thus the Rājput States, who were, as Lord Hastings himself said, "natural allies" of the Company, sacrificed their independence for protection and accepted British paramountcy. It is difficult to agree with Prinsep that the "good government and tranquillity" of Rājputāna were "the exclusive aims" of the Company in interfering in its affairs. In fact, the guiding considerations of Lord Hastings in his relations with the Rājput States were political "expediency and convenience" and strategic advantages.

The Nawāb of Bhopal entered into a treaty of "defensive and subordinate alliance" with the Company, and Jaorā being created an independent entity by the Treaty of Mandasor with the Holkar was given to Ghafur Khān, a relation (their wives were sisters) of Amīr Khān, Nawāb of Tonk, in return for the help he rendered to Sir John Malcolm. The minor States of Mālwa and Bundelkhand also acknowledged British supremacy. A band of able British officers effected the work of reconstruction and administrative consolidation in these States: Elphinstone in the Western Deccan, Munro in Madras, Malcolm in Central India, and Metcalfe, Tod and Ochterlony in Rājputāna. Students of Indian history have special reason to be grateful to most of them for the valuable works they have left behind, particularly Tod's *Rājasthān* and Malcolm's *Memoir of Central India.*

Thus the close of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century saw the fall of those Indian powers which arose or revived on the decline of the Mughul Empire and contended for political supremacy; and as a result of a number of political and military transactions, the British Government became the paramount power over a dominion extending from the Himālayas to Cape Comorin and from the Sutlej to the Brahmaputra. Clive sowed the seed of the British Empire in India; Warren Hastings preserved it against hostile forces; Wellesley reared it; and Lord Hastings reaped the harvest. Delhi, Oudh, Mysore, Hyderābād, the Carnatic, Surāt and Tanjore

passed under British control, for all practical purposes, in the time of Wellesley. Lord Hastings pushed further the bounds of British imperialism. He shattered the Marātha power beyond any hope of recovery and extinguished the Peshwāship, established British control over Central India, and persuaded the weak and harassed Rājput States to barter away their independence for British protection. Another significant step taken by him was the formal abolition of the fiction of the Mughul Government. Mughul supremacy had ceased to exist in fact more than half a century earlier. All the attempts of the Emperor Shāh 'Ālam II to restore it proved futile; and he had to spend his days in pitiable circumstances, sometimes as a wanderer seeking help hither and thither and sometimes at Delhi amidst the ruins of its ancient greatness. His name and personality were utilised for their own purposes by the Marāthas, the English, and probably also by the French. Warren Hastings stopped the payment of the Bengal tribute to the Emperor on the ground that he had placed himself under the protection of the Marāthas; and his successors gradually declared the Company's freedom from obligations to the descendant of the Great Mughuls. After Delhi had come under British control in 1803, Shāh 'Ālam II lived virtually as a pensioner of the Company till he closed his eyes for ever in 1806. His successor, Ākbar II, was asked by Lord Hastings to give up all ceremonial "implying supremacy over the Company's dominions" and it was not long before the titular dignity of the Mughul Rāj finally disappeared.

CHAPTER V

EXPANSION OF THE BRITISH DOMINION BEYOND THE BRAHMAPUTRA AND THE SUTLEJ, 1824–1856

1. Factors in the Political History of this Period

REFERRING to the achievements of Lord Hastings, who left India on the 1st January, 1823, Prinsep, a contemporary writer, observed: "The struggle which has thus ended in the universal establishment of British influence, is particularly important and worthy of attention, as it promises to be the *last* we shall ever have to maintain with the native powers of India." But this optimistic prophecy did not turn out to be wholly true. There is no doubt that by the year 1823 the greater part of India, extending from the Sutlej to the Brahmaputra and from the Himālayas to Cape Comorin, fell under British control. But there were beyond the western and eastern limits already reached by the British arms, powers whose activities had been a source of great anxiety to the Mughuls and whose subjugation was indispensably necessary for the rising British power before it could establish an all-India Empire on a firm and secure basis. In short, an Indian Empire, without effective control over the western and eastern frontiers of the country, was an idle dream. This was proved by the subsequent conflicts of the English with the Sikhs, the Sindhis, the Pathān and Baloch tribes of the north-west frontier, and the Afghāns beyond the Khyber Pass, and with the Burmese and the Assamese to the east of the Brahmaputra. Further, the growth of the new political authority inevitably gave rise to varied problems. It clashed with the interests of some who continued to nurse against it a feeling of discontent. This was aggravated by the Company's policy of annexation and led to a violent outburst in the Revolt of 1857–1859, when British supremacy in India was put to a severe test. The foreign policy of the Company during this period received a new orientation. Sir Alfred Lyall observes: "As the expansion of our dominion carried us so much nearer to foreign Asiatic countries, our rapid approach to the geographical limits of India proper discovered for us fresh complications and we were now on the brink of collision

with new races." Hitherto the Company's external policy had been influenced by French projects and ambitions in the Near and Middle East and in India. The French menace disappeared with the fall of Napoleon, but Russia now stepped into the place of France. The expansion of Russia in Asia, and her various ambitious enterprises in the East, proved to be the dominating factor in the foreign policy of the East India Company in the post-Waterloo period.

2. The Eastern Frontier and the Burmese Wars

A. The First Anglo-Burmese War

When Lord Hastings left India, Mr. John Adam, a senior member of the Council, acted as Governor-General till the arrival of Lord Amherst, who took charge of his office on coming to India in August, 1823. The most important event of the new Governor-General's regime was the First Anglo-Burmese War.

The English had had commercial intercourse with Burma since the seventeenth century. But the growth of their Indian dominion, and at the same time the establishment of the sway of a Tibeto-Chinese race over Arākān, Pegu and Tenāsserim, situated south of Chittāgong, during the second half of the eighteenth century, brought the two powers into political relations in the nineteenth century. About 1750 a Burman chief named Ālomprā conquered the province of Pegu from the Tailangas in the delta of the Irrāwaddy and established there a strong monarchy. His successors, notably Bodawpaya who reigned from 1779 to 1819 and was followed by Hpagyidoa, extended the kingdom in different directions. The Burmese seized Tenāsserim from Siam in 1766; subjugated the hitherto independent kingdom of Arākān in 1784, and conquered Manipur, near the Surma valley, in 1813.

The advance of the Burmese towards the eastern frontier of the Company's dominion, which continued to remain "very ill-defined and variable", made an Anglo-Burmese conflict inevitable. But being engaged seriously in other parts of India, the Calcutta Government tried at first to prevent an immediate rupture by sending envoys to Burma—Captain Symes in 1795 and again in 1802; Captain Cox in 1797; and Captain Canning in 1803, 1809, 1811. The envoys were not treated well and the missions proved unsuccessful. The refusal of the Company's Government to comply with Burmese demands for the surrender of fugitives who, fleeing from the territories conquered by the Burmese, took shelter on the British border and from their new base made inroads into

Burmese territories, served to render relations more strained. Thus when the English were engaged in suppressing the Pindarīs, the King of Avā sent a letter to Lord Hastings demanding the surrender of Chittāgong, Dacca, Murshidābād and Cāssimbāzār, which in medieval times paid tribute to the ruler of Arākān. The Pindarī menace was over before Hastings received this letter. The Governor-General returned it to the Burmese king with the comment that it was perhaps a forgery.

But the Burmese commanders soon conquered Assam in 1821–1822 and thus came directly in contact with the ill-defined British frontier on the north-east. They further captured in September, 1823, the Shāhpurī island, near Chittāgong, belonging to the Company, drove away the British outposts from that island to Dudpatli and made preparations for an attack on the Company's territories in Bengal. This was too much for the English to bear, and Lord Amherst, the Governor-General, declared war on the 24th February, 1824. The Burmese had the best means of defence in the physical features of their country, "which was one vast expanse of forest and morass, laced longitudinally by mountain ranges and the valleys of the Irrāwāddy, Sittang and Salween" Further, though in open fighting the Burmese soldiers were a poor match for the trained British troops, yet they were expert in quickly preparing stockades of timber and in "throwing up earth-works and sinking rifle-pits". The British plan was to attack Rangoon by sea, and they sent an expedition under General Sir Archibald Campbell, with 11,000 men, mostly recruited from Madras, and with ships under Captain Marryat, the novelist.

The British troops were able to expel the Burmese from Assam, but Bandulā, the ablest of the Burmese generals who had advanced to invade Bengal, repelled a British detachment at Rāmu on the Chittāgong frontier. This could not, however, prevent a British attack on Rangoon, which was captured by Campbell on the 11th May, 1824. Without resisting the invaders, the Burmese fled into the jungles of Pegu carrying with them all kinds of supplies. The British troops were put to great hardships for lack of provisions. Their difficulties were aggravated by the unhealthiness of the place due to the rains. Their sufferings were terrible till the close of the rainy season. In the meanwhile, Bandulā had been recalled to relieve the Burmese and had arrived before Rangoon on the 1st December with 60,000 men. He was, however, defeated on the 15th December and retreated to Donābew, where he held out bravely till the beginning of April, 1825, when he was killed by a chance shot. This was indeed a terrible loss to the Burmese.

Campbell occupied Prome, the capital of Lower Burma, on the 25th April and spent the rainy season there. After some futile negotiations for peace, fighting recommenced towards the end of 1825. The British troops having baffled all the opposition of the Burmese marched to Yandāboo, within sixty miles of the Burmese capital. On the 24th February, 1826, the Burmese concluded a treaty, the terms of which, as dictated by Campbell, provided for the payment of a crore of rupees as war indemnity by the King of Avā; the absolute surrender by him of the provinces of Arākān and Tenāsserim; abstention of the Burmese from interference of any kind in Assam, Cāchār and Jaintiā; their recognition of Manipur as an independent State; the conclusion of a commercial treaty "upon principles of reciprocal advantages"; and the admission of a British Resident at Avā, a Burmese envoy being allowed to come to Calcutta. A commercial treaty of a rather unsatisfactory nature was concluded on the 23rd November, 1826; and a British Resident was not accepted until 1830. From 1830 to 1840, the Residency was held successively by Major Burney and Colonel Benson. King Hpagyidoa, being seized with melancholia, was deposed in May, 1837, in favour of his brother Tharrawaddy and was kept in confinement till he expired.

There is no doubt that the English secured important advantages out of the First Anglo-Burmese War. They deprived the Burmese of the greater part of their sea-coast, and Assam, Cāchār and Manipur became practically their protectorates. But this cost them much in men and money, owing largely to the inefficiency and blunders both of the Governor-General, who being a man of mediocre abilities could not pursue a strong and consistent policy, and of the generals, who did not possess sufficient initiative to act promptly according to the needs of the situation. But for the timely despatch of reinforcements in men and provisions by Sir Thomas Munro, the Governor of Madras, the British troops in Burma would have been subject to greater hardships and the whole expedition might have been a failure. Though ultimately defeated, the Burmese soldiers, who, as Phayre admits, "fought under conditions which rendered victory . . . impossible" for them, deserve credit for the manner in which they tried bravely to resist the invaders and the skill they displayed in building stockades. A writer competent in such matters has asserted that "the position and defences at Donoobew, as a field-work, would have done credit to the most scientific engineer".

The early reverses and difficulties of the British in Burma gave rise to a conviction in certain quarters that the British dominion

was faced with impending ruin. This resulted in risings in some places. In Bharatpur, the claim of the minor son of a deceased ruler, who had been placed on the throne with the consent of Sir David Ochterlony, the British Resident at Delhi, was contested by his cousin, Durjan Sal. Lord Amherst at first followed a policy of non-intervention, and disapproved of the conduct of Sir David Ochterlony in trying to enforce his decision at the point of the sword, which led to the latter's resignation and the appointment of Sir Charles Metcalfe in his place. Sir David Ochterlony, an old man in bad health, soon died. The new Resident, Sir Charles Metcalfe, urged the necessity of vindicating the prestige of the British Government by opposing the pretensions of the usurper and won over the Governor-General to his view. An expedition was eventually sent under Lord Combermere, who in January, 1826, stormed the fortress of Bharatpur, which had resisted the attacks of Lord Lake in 1805. Durjan Sal was deported. Another disturbance that demands notice was the mutiny of the Sepoys at Bārrāckpore, which "was only quelled after the mutinous regiments had been fired upon by the British artillery and the parade-ground made a shambles".

B. The Second Anglo-Burmese War

Something more was needed even after the gains of the First Anglo-Burmese War to establish effective British control on the eastern frontier of India. The new King of Burma, Tharrawaddy (1837–1845), refused to consider the Treaty of Yandāboo to be binding on him, and technically his action was "within the Burmese constitution, whereby all existing rights lapsed at a new King's accession until he chose to confirm them". But this was opposed to British interests, which were affected also in other ways. The British Residents at the court of Avā did not receive courteous treatment, for which reason the Residency had to be finally withdrawn in 1840, and British merchants, who had settled on the southern coast of Burma after the treaty of 1826, complained of oppression at the hands of the Governor of Rangoon. The merchants asked the Calcutta Government to intervene in the matter in order to redress their grievances. Lord Dalhousie sent a frigate under Commodore Lambert to Pagan, the new King of Burma (1845–1852), who had succeeded to the throne after his father, Tharrawaddy, had been put under restraint on the ground of his insanity, to demand compensation for the losses of the British merchants and to ask for the removal of the governor of Rangoon.

If the Governor-General sincerely desired a peaceful settlement, his object was not fulfilled by the despatch of a Commodore, which has rightly been considered to be an unnecessarily provocative measure. Dalhousie himself observed later on that "these commodores are too combustible for negotiations".

The King of Burma, inclined to avoid war, gave a courteous reply to Lambert's demands, removed the old governor and sent a new officer to settle the matter peacefully. But when a deputation of some senior naval officers sent by Lambert to the new governor was refused admission on the pretext that he was asleep, the British Commodore felt insulted, declared the port of Rangoon to be in a state of blockade and seized a ship of the Burmese king's. At this the Burmese batteries opened fire on the British frigate and the British Commodore returned the fire.

It appears from some documents that Lambert acted contrary to the Governor-General's orders and the latter censured his precipitancy. But he did not disavow the Commodore's act but rather "accepted the responsibility" for it and sent an ultimatum to the Burmese Government demanding compensation and an indemnity of £100,000, to be paid by the 1st April, 1852. At the same time, vigorous preparations were made under his personal supervision for the impending conflict with the Burmese so that the blunders of the First Anglo-Burmese War might be avoided. His ultimatum received no reply, and on the day it expired, 1st April, 1852, British forces under General Godwin, a veteran of the First Anglo-Burmese War, and Admiral Austen, reached Rangoon. Martabān fell quickly; the famous pagoda of Rangoon was stormed on the 14th April; and Bassein, situated on the north-west corner of the Irrāwaddy delta, was captured about a month later. Dalhousie went to Rangoon in September; Prome was occupied in October and Pegu in November. The Governor-General had no desire to advance into Upper Burma but stipulated that the conquests in the lower part of the country should be recognised by the King of Burma by a formal agreement On the refusal of the King to conclude such a treaty, he annexed Pegu or Lower Burma by a proclamation on the 20th December, 1852.

By the annexation of Pegu the eastern frontier of the British Indian Empire was extended up to the banks of the Salween. British control was established over the whole of the eastern coast of the Bay of Bengal, and access to the sea was closed to the attenuated Burmese kingdom. Major (afterwards Sir) Arthur Phayre was appointed Commissioner of the newly acquired British province extending as far north as Myede, fifty miles beyond

Prome, and with the co-operation of Captain (afterwards General) Fytche he tried to introduce necessary administrative reforms.

3. British Relations with the Sikhs and Annexation of the Punjab

A. Rise of the Sikh Power

The Sikh struggle for independence from 1708 to 1716 under the temporal leadership of Bāndā came to a disastrous end by the year 1716. Bāndā was tortured to death and his followers were subjected to relentless persecution at the hands of the Mughuls. But the repression could not kill, out and out, the military spirit of the Khālsā. Rather, the growing weakness of the Delhi Empire gave the Sikhs an opportunity to reorganise themselves. The invasion of Nādir Shāh in 1739, and the first three Abdālī inroads (1748–1752), by enfeebling Mughul hold on the Punjab and throwing this province into confusion, enabled the Sikhs to enrich themselves and to enhance their military power as well as political influence. In the course of the next few years they "passed through a series of reverses to complete victory". They baffled all the attempts of the Abdālī invader to crush them, and defied him even after his victory at Pānīpat. When he left Lahore for his home on the 12th December, 1762, the Sikhs pursued him, hung about his army and harassed it in every way. Their aggressions were aggravated through the inefficiency of the Abdālī's lieutenants in the Punjab, over which they began to dominate, and they occupied Lahore in February, 1764. "The whole country from the Jhilam to the Satlaj was partitioned among the Sikh chiefs and their followers, as the plains of Sarhind had been in the previous year." They assembled at Amritsar and proclaimed the sway of their commonwealth and faith by striking coins to the effect that Guru Govind had obtained from Nānak *degh*, *tegh*, *fateh*, or grace, power and rapid victory. After the final retirement of Ahmad Shāh Abdālī from India in 1767, the Sikhs wrested his Indian conquests from his weak successor, Tīmūr Shāh; and by the year 1773, Sikh sway extended from Shāhrānpur in the east to Attock in the west, and from Multān in the south to Kangrā and Jammu in the north.

The independence of the Sikhs was thus realised, and they formed themselves into twelve *misls* or confederacies: the Bhangi, the Kanheya, the Sukerchakia, the Nakai, the Fyzullapuria, the Ahluwalia, the Ramgarhia, the Dalewalia, the Karora Singhia, the Nishanwala, the Sahid and Nihang, and the Phulkia. This

organisation of the Sikhs has been described as "theocratic confederate feudalism". But with the disappearance of a common enemy, jealousies and discords appeared among the leaders of the Sikh *misls*, who began to pursue a policy of self-aggrandisement at a time when British imperialism was rapidly expanding over India. To organise the Sikhs into a national monarchy on the destruction of feudalism was the work of a man of destiny, Ranjit Singh, whose rise must be briefly surveyed before we study the relations between the Sikhs and the English.

B. Ranjit Singh

Ranjit Singh was born on the 13th November, 1780. He was the son of Māhā Singh, the leader of the Sukerchakia *misl*, by his wife of the Jhind family. Unlike Shivājī, Ranjit spent his early life amidst uninspiring surroundings. He was but a boy of ten when his father died in 1790; and he was then the head only of a small confederacy with a little territory and very limited military resources, while there were many other superior chiefs. But the Indian invasions of Zamān Shāh of Kābul, during 1793–1798, exercised a decisive influence on his career. In return for the conspicuous services that Zamān Shāh received from Ranjit, he appointed him governor of Lahore at the age of nineteen, with the title of Rājā, in A.D. 1798. This grant of office by an Afghān ruler, against whose ambitious ancestor, Ahmad Shāh Abdālī, the Sikhs had fought stubbornly for mastery over the Punjab, marked the beginning of an "astonishingly successful military career", whose exploits resulted in the extinction of Afghān supremacy in the Punjab and the building up of a strong Sikh national monarchy. Ranjit threw off the Afghān yoke before long, and, taking advantage of the differences and quarrels among the chiefs of the Trans-Sutlej *misls*, gradually absorbed them into his kingdom. In 1805 Holkar, pursued by Lord Lake, sought Ranjit's help; but the Sikh chief did not comply with his request. Ranjit Singh was relieved of this new menace by the conclusion of the Treaty of Lahore on the 1st January, 1806, which excluded Holkar from the Punjab and left Ranjit Singh free to carry on his conquests north of the Sutlej.

But Ranjit Singh aimed at supremacy over all the Sikhs. He "laboured", writes Cunningham, "with more or less of intelligent design, to give unity and coherence to diverse atoms and scattered elements, to mould the increasing Sikh nation into a well-ordered state, or commonwealth, as Govind had developed a

sect into a people, and had given application and purpose to the general institutions of Nānak". The realisation of this aim required the establishment of Ranjit Singh's control over the Cis-Sutlej States lying between that river and the Jumnā. The chronic disorders and discords among these Cis-Sutlej States brought upon them Marātha aggressions resulting in the establishment of Marātha influence in the Cis-Sutlej Sikh country after Mahādājī Sindhia's treaty of 1785 with the Sikhs. But subsequently the British succeeded in driving out Sindhia and in bringing the Cis-Sutlej States informally under their protection. Neither the Marāthas nor the English had any sound claim upon them, but in those days of disorder the best claim was "that of the sword".

The rapid successes of Ranjit Singh made his intervention in the affairs of the Cis-Sutlej States inevitable. Quarrels among the local Sikh chiefs, and an appeal for his help by some of them, gave him the pretext for undertaking Cis-Sutlej expeditions in 1806 and 1807 and occupying Ludhiānā. This extension of Ranjit's influence was not liked by some of the Sikh chiefs, who waited upon Mr. Seton, the British Resident at Delhi, in March, 1808, soliciting British help against Ranjit Singh. Their appeal passed unheeded.

But for strategic and diplomatic reasons, the English soon thought it necessary to check Ranjit Singh's eastern advance to the Jumnā. They could not, however, resort to force at once, because it would have been prejudicial to their interests to antagonise a power in the north-west of India in view of the possibility of a French invasion of the country in alliance with the Turks and the Persians. Lord Minto took recourse to diplomacy. With the double object of resisting Ranjit's advance and enlisting his friendship against an apprehended French invasion, he sent Metcalfe on a mission to the Sikh king to negotiate for an offensive and defensive alliance against the French, if they should ever invade India through Persia. Calculating that the British Government stood badly in need of his friendship, Ranjit conquered as much of the Cis-Sutlej territory as he could; and also boldly demanded from the English acknowledgment of his sovereignty over all the Sikh States as the price of the proposed alliance. But in the meanwhile the danger of Napoleon's invasion of India had disappeared owing to his engagement in the Peninsular War, and relations between Turkey and England had improved after the conclusion of the Treaty of the Dardanelles by these powers in January, A.D. 1809.

Encouraged by this change in the political situation, the British Government decided not to purchase Ranjit's alliance at such a

high cost, but "to oppose the extension on the Indian side of the Sutlej of an ambitious military power which would be substituted upon our (British) frontier for a confederacy of friendly chiefs rendered grateful by our protection and interested in our cause". A body of troops was sent under David Ochterlony to enforce the demands of the English. The fear of British arms, and the apprehension that the jealous Sikh States on the east of Sutlej would throw themselves under British protection, led Ranjit to sign a treaty of "perpetual friendship" with the English at Amritsar on the 25th April, 1809. By this treaty, Ranjit's activities



ZAMZAMA
The gun employed at the siege of Multān

were confined to the right side of the Sutlej, and the Cis-Sutlej States came definitely under British protection. The British frontier was extended from the Jumnā to the Sutlej and English troops were stationed at Ludhiānā. Thus Ranjit had to give up the most cherished ideal of his life—that of undisputed mastery over all the Sikhs. Ranjit's "failure to absorb the Cis-Sutlej States was", remarks his latest biographer, "a tragedy of Sikh militant nationalism and the success of the Cis-Sutlej States with the aid of the British Government marked the disruption of the great creation of Guru Govind Singh".

Ranjit's ambition for eastern expansion being thus foiled, it sought outlets in the north, the north-west and the west. He

was successful in his conflicts with the Gurkhās from 1809 to 1811 and captured the Kangrā district. On the 13th July, 1813, he severely defeated the Afghāns at Haidāru and captured Attock, the key to the frontier, which he arranged to have strongly garrisoned. Driven from Afghānistān the Afghān king, Shāh Shujā, sought shelter at Lahore (1813–1814), when Ranjit took from him the world-famous diamond the Koh-i-nūr. Shāh Shujā succeeded in escaping from Lahore in April, 1815, and retired to Ludhiānā within the British sphere of influence. After several attempts, Ranjit captured Multān in 1818 and occupied Kāshmīr in 1819. Peshāwār also became his dependency in 1823. Thus by the year 1824 the largest part of the Indus valley was included within Ranjit's dominions.

With a view to utilising the growing Sikh kingdom as a buffer state against the suspected Russian designs on India, Lord William Bentinck met Ranjit Singh at Rooper on the Sutlej in October, 1831, and managed to get the treaty of alliance with him renewed. On the 6th May, 1834, the citadel of Peshāwār was captured by the Sikh general Hari Singh Naola (Nalwa) and Peshāwār passed formally under Sikh control. But the further ambitions of Ranjit with regard to the Afghāns were restrained by the English. The kingdom of Sindh also felt the impact of Sikh expansion. As a matter of fact, the occupation of Sindh was important to Ranjit as it would increase the compactness of his dominions, because Sindh and the Punjab were "provinces of the Indus as Bengal and Bihār are provinces of the Ganges". But here too he was forestalled and checked by the English. Nevertheless, Ranjit succeeded in establishing a kingdom large in extent and rich in fame, before he died on the 27th June, 1839, at the age of fifty-nine.

Ranjit Singh is one of the most important personalities in the history of modern India. Though his physical appearance was not particularly handsome and an attack of small-pox deprived him of sight in the left eye, he had delightful manners and address and inspiring features. He was, writes Cunningham, "assiduous in his devotions; he honoured men of reputed sanctity, and enabled them to practise an enlarged charity; he attributed every success to the favour of God, and he styled himself and his people collectively the 'Khalsa' or Commonwealth of Govind".

A born ruler of men, Ranjit is entitled to fame chiefly for his success in effecting the marvellous transformation of the warring Sikh States into a compact national monarchy, though his ideal of Pan-Sikhism could not be realised owing to the intervention of the British on behalf of the Cis-Sutlej States. One of his biographers,

Sir Lepel Griffin, observes: "We only succeed in establishing him as a hero, as a ruler of men and as worthy of a pedestal in that innermost shrine where history honours the few human beings to whom may be indisputably assigned the palm of greatness, if we free our minds of prejudice and, discounting conventional virtue, only regard those rare qualities which raise a man supreme above his fellows. Then we shall at once allow that, although sharing in full measure the commonplace and worse vices of his time and education, he yet ruled the country which his military genius had conquered with vigour of will and an ability which placed him in the front rank of the statesmen of the century." Victor Jacquemont, a French traveller to Ranjit's court, described him as "an extraordinary man—a Bonaparte in miniature". Ranjit fully realised the need of a strong army for the task which he had set before himself and so radically changed the feudal levies of the Sikh chiefs, "brave indeed, but ignorant of war as an art", into a strong and efficient national army, which was thoroughly under his command, and which, according to Hunter, "for steadiness and religious fervour has had no parallel since the 'Ironsides' of Oliver Cromwell". The initiative for army reform came from Ranjit himself, and the bulk of his army was formed by the Sikhs. Though he was assisted in this work by European officers of various nationalities like Allard, Ventura, Court, Avitabile, and others, some of whom had experience of the Napoleonic wars in Europe, his army did not become denationalised, and he always maintained a strict control over it. His artillery was very efficient.

Though a great conqueror, Ranjit was not stern by nature but, on the other hand, showed kindness and consideration towards his fallen foes. Baron Carl von Hügel, a German traveller who visited Ranjit's court in 1835, tells us that he never "wantonly imbued his hands in blood. Never perhaps was so large an empire founded by one man with so little criminality". Ranjit was indeed a strong ruler with absolute control over his government, but he was not a tyrant "obsessed by the idea of over-centralisation". In his government "subordinate rights" were preserved; and his civil administration was far from being unduly severe, though it lacked certain features of a well-organised administration like elaborate laws, a fixed judiciary, or an efficient police. A contemporary British officer reports: "In a territory compactly situated, he has applied himself to those improvements which spring only from great minds and here we find despotism without its rigours, a despot without cruelty and a system of government far beyond the native institutions of the East, though far from the civilisation

of Europe." Manufactures and trade flourished in Ranjit's kingdom. English writers have praised the Sikh king for his "statesman-like recognition of the strength of the East India Company, the reliance he placed upon British promises, and his loyalty to his plighted word", in which respect he differed both from Hyder and Tipu. But it is noted by some critics that he displayed a lack of intrepidity and bold statesmanship in his dealings with the English. He created a Sikh kingdom but took no steps to prevent British dominion, of which he had a presentiment when he said "*sab lāl ho jāyegā*"; he chose instead the line of least resistance.

C. The First Anglo-Sikh War

The structure of the Sikh military monarchy built up by Ranjit was not destined to last long. As is the case with such systems, its continuance or growth depended on the guidance of a strong personality, particularly in view of the rapid march of British imperialism in India at that time. The Sikhs were at the height of their power at the time of Ranjit's exit from this world; but "then it exploded", as General Sir J. H. Gordon puts it, "disappearing in fierce but fading flames". As a matter of fact, the death of Ranjit was the signal for the beginning of anarchy and confusion within his dominions, which, being prolonged, greatly weakened the Sikh power and ultimately led to its submission to the English. One weak ruler after another was deposed in quick succession till in 1843 Dalip Singh, a minor, was acknowledged as king with his mother, Rānī Jhindān, as Regent. The struggles and convulsions of the period caused the collapse of the central civil government and resulted in the ascendancy of the Khālsā army through its delegates the *Panchayets* or Committees of five. Unrestrained by any strong authority, the army grew ungovernable and furious, and became the virtual dictator of the State. Unable to control the army or to defy it openly, the Lahore Darbār in its intense anxiety to get rid of this terrible incubus devised the plan of inducing it to invade British territory, in the belief that it would either be totally destroyed in the course of its war with the English or its "super-abundant energies" would be exhausted in a career of conquest. Thus the position was that the Sikh cause was almost doomed before the war broke out owing to the half-heartedness of its leaders; and the English, as Roberts points out, fought "against a fine army without a general, or, at any rate, without one supreme controlling mind".

Besides the activities of the Darbār, some provocative acts on the

part of the English, which served to convince the Sikh army of the desire of "their colossal neighbour" to take their country and destroy their independence, egged it on to enter upon a war. The English sent bodies of troops towards the Sutlej; during 1844 and 1845 they were preparing boats at Bombay with the object of constructing bridges across the Sutlej; troops were equipped in the newly-conquered territory of Sind for an attack on Multān; and the various garrisons in the north-west districts were being gradually strengthened. To the Sikh army, all this was "held to denote", writes Cunningham, "a campaign, not of defence, but of aggression".

Thus the Sikh army's apprehensions of a British attack on the Sikh territory, at a time when the East India Company had been definitely pursuing a policy of annexation, were not unfounded. The Khālsā crossed the Sutlej unopposed on the 11th December, 1845, not through any lack of preparations on the part of the English, whose army in the frontier districts had been already reinforced, and had increased to 40,000 men and 100 guns, but owing to the personal misconceptions and negligence of Major Broadfoot, the British commander at Ferozepore. The Governor-General, Sir Henry (afterwards Lord) Hardinge, promptly rose to the occasion. He issued a proclamation of war on the 13th December, 1845, and declared all Sikh possessions on the left bank of the Sutlej confiscated and annexed to the British dominions. The first battle, fought at Mudki, situated twenty miles to the south-east of Ferozepore, between the combined Ambālā and Ludhiānā branches of the British troops under the command of Sir Hugh Gough and the Sikh army under Lāl Singh, was sharp and bloody. The brave Sikh infantry vigorously charged the Sepoys and European soldiers, who at first reeled before the accurate fire of the enemy. But the supineness of Lāl Singh at a critical moment spoiled the chances of the Sikhs, who were in the end defeated with heavy losses. The English casualties were also heavy: 657 of their soldiers were wounded and 215, including Major-General Sir Robert Sale, the defender of Jalalābād, and Major-General Sir John McCaskill, were killed. The British army next attacked the Sikh entrenchments at Feroze Shāh (Firuzshuhur), about twelve miles from the Sutlej, on the 21st December, 1845. The Sikhs offered a stubborn and formidable resistance and repulsed battalion after battalion by furious firing. The English were indeed faced with a grave situation. "During that night of horrors," the Commander-in-Chief wrote later, "we were in a critical and perilous state." But the brave Sikh warriors were again betrayed by their

general, Tej Singh, who left the field all of a sudden. Thus the Sikhs ultimately gave up the battle, to the immense relief of their adversaries, and retreated across the Sutlej. "Had a guiding mind directed the movements of the Sikh army," observes Malleson, "nothing could have saved the exhausted British." The losses on both sides were heavy. On the English side 694 men were killed, including 103 officers, and 1,721 were wounded; and the Sikhs lost 8,000 men and 73 guns.

After their victory at Feroze Shāh, the British army remained somewhat "paralyzed" for some time waiting for guns, ammunition and stores from Delhi, when the Sikhs again crossed the Sutlej under Ranjur Singh Majhithia in January, 1846, and attacked the frontier station of Ludhiānā. Sir Harry Smith (afterwards governor of Cape Colony), who was sent to check the advance of the Khalsa, was defeated in a skirmish at Buddewal on the 21st January. Reinforced by additional troops, he defeated the Sikhs, in spite of their brave resistance, at Āliwal, to the west of Ludhiānā, on the 28th January, 1846. The vanquished army was deprived of sixty-seven guns and was driven across the Sutlej. The final battle took place at Sobrāon on the Sutlej, where the main body of the Sikh army was strongly entrenched. Here also the Sikh soldiers showed wonderful steadfastness and resolution and fought from the early dawn of the 10th February "with the valour of heroes, the enthusiasm of crusaders, and the desperation of zealots sworn to conquer the enemy or die sword in hand." But all this proved to be of no avail, owing to the half-heartedness and treachery of almost all the Sikh generals with the honourable exception of Shām Singh; and by about one p.m. the Sikhs were defeated and their formidable entrenchments were stormed by the British army. A large number of Sikhs were slaughtered by the infuriated British soldiers, while crossing the Sutlej; on the English side 320 were killed and 2,083 were wounded.

The victory of the English at Sobrāon was of a decisive nature. They were relieved of the danger from "the bravest and steadiest enemy ever encountered in India" which almost shook to the very base the edifice of British dominion in the Upper Provinces. As a reward for these brilliant victories of great significance, the authorities in England, justly jubilant over the fall of the Sikhs, conferred peerages on the Governor-General, Sir Henry Hardinge, and the Commander-in-Chief, Sir Hugh Gough; and freely distributed honours and favours among all ranks.

The Governor-General with the victorious British army crossed the Sutlej by a bridge of boats on the 13th February and occupied

Lahore on the 20th February. The Sikhs, now utterly prostrate, had no alternative but to submit to any arrangement that Lord Hardinge might impose on them. He, however, shrank from complete annexation of the Punjab in view of the necessity of greater forces for this purpose than what he had at his disposal; and he also abstained from the expedient of subsidiary alliance in consideration of the future disadvantages of this course. He dictated a treaty to the vanquished Sikhs in their own capital on the 9th March, 1846. By it the Sikhs were required to cede to the British all territories to the south of the Sutlej, together with the extensive Jullundur Doāb, lying between the Sutlej and the Beas. A heavy war indemnity amounting to one and a half crores of rupees was paid by the Lahore Darbār, fifty lacs in cash and the balance by ceding to the British the hill districts between the Beas and the Indus including Kāshmīr and Hazarā. The Sikh army was reduced to 25 battalions of infantry and 12,000 cavalry, and 36 guns, besides those already captured, were surrendered to the English. The Sikhs were prevented from employing any British, European or American subject, and from changing the limits of their territory, without the consent of the British Government. The minor Dalip Singh was recognised as the Mahārājā with Rānī Jhindān as his regent and Lāl Singh as the chief minister. The Governor-General agreed not to interfere in the internal administration of the Lahore State. But it was provided that a British force, sufficient to protect the person of the Mahārājā, should be stationed at Lahore till the close of the year 1846; and Henry Lawrence was appointed British Resident there. To reduce the Lahore State in size, Kāshmīr was sold by the English to Golāb Singh, a *sardār* of the Lahore Darbār, in return for one million sterling, by a separate treaty concluded with him at Amritsar on the 16th March. This arrangement, remarks Cunningham, "was a dexterous one, if reference be only had to the policy of reducing the power of the Sikhs; but the transaction scarcely seems worthy of the British name and greatness, and the objections become stronger when it is considered that Golāb Singh had agreed to pay sixty-eight lacs of rupees as a fine to his paramount authority before the war broke out, and that the custom of the East as well as of the West requires the feudatory to aid his lord in foreign war and domestic strife. Golāb Singh ought thus to have paid the deficient million of money as a Lahore subject, instead of being put in possession of Lahore provinces as an independent prince".

The outbreak of some disorders, particularly an insurrection against Golāb Singh at the instigation of Lāl Singh, who was

dismissed for this offence, led to a revision of the original Lahore treaty on the 16th December, 1846, in such a manner as served to bring the Punjab under the more effective control of the English. It transferred the Lahore administration to the hands of a Council of Regency of eight Sikh *sardārs*, who were to act under the virtual dictatorship of the British Resident. A British force was to be maintained at Lahore, the Government of which was to pay twenty-two lacs of rupees for its expenses. It was laid down that the new arrangements were to continue till the Mahārājā attained his majority on the 4th September, 1854, or till such period as the Governor-General and the Lahore Darbār might think necessary. The British Resident, Sir Henry Lawrence, sailed for England with Lord Hardinge on the 18th January, 1848; and his office, being held, for a brief interval, by his brother Sir John (afterwards Lord) Lawrence, was given to Sir Frederick Currie on the 6th April, 1848.

D. The Second Anglo-Sikh War and Annexation of the Punjab

Lord Hardinge's arrangements in the Punjab with the Sikh chiefs lacked any "prospects of permanence". The defeat of the Sikh army did not mean the extinction of national aspirations among the Sikh people, who had behind them traditions of brilliant achievements and had so recently opposed the English with grim determination. They justly attributed their humiliation to the treachery of their leaders and chafed under the ascendancy of the English in the Punjab. The removal of the Queen-mother, Rānī Jhindān, from Lahore, on a charge of conspiracy against the British Resident, added to their discontent. A violent outburst in the shape of a national rising was imminent. Another trial of strength between the disaffected Sikhs and their victorious adversaries was inevitable, and it occurred very soon, the immediate occasion being supplied by an incident in the city of Multān.

Diwān Mulrāj, governor of Multān, was in financial trouble through a fall in the revenue-collection in his district, and on being pressed by the Lahore Darbār for a payment of one million sterling, as the price of his office, he resigned in anger in March, 1848. The Lahore Darbār appointed Sardār Khān Singh in his place and sent him to take charge of Multān in the company of two young British officers, Vans Agnew of the Civil Service and Lieutenant Anderson of the Bombay European Regiment. These two officers were murdered on the 20th April. It was believed that the crime was committed at the instigation of Mulrāj, who made preparations

for resisting the English. The Commander-in-Chief, Lord Gough, and the Governor-General, Lord Dalhousie, did not adopt any immediate measures to suppress the rising but decided to wait till the cold weather. Their policy was approved by the home authorities but was subjected to much criticism in other quarters. It is, however, true that there were political motives behind their action. Besides taking into consideration the difficulties of distant campaigns and the movement of troops during the hot weather and the rains, they wanted to gauge the strength of the Lahore Government and its ability to quell the disturbance, which it was technically bound to do, and also not to risk much in trying only to reduce it when there were sufficient indications of a widespread Multān rising. Despite the "wait and see" policy of the Supreme Government, a young British lieutenant named Herbert Edwardes, who was employed under the Sikh Council of Regency, and the British Resident, Currie, made some unsuccessful attempts to suppress the rising and besiege Multān. Sher Singh, son of Chatter Singh, the Sikh governor of the Hazarā district, unwisely sent by the British Resident to join the besieging troops at Multān, went over to the side of Mulrāj on the 14th September, 1848. The activities of Rānī Jhindān added fuel to the fire of Sikh discontent, and the veteran Sikh leaders began to rally round Sher Singh. Thus the Multān revolt soon assumed the nature of a Sikh national movement, and the inevitable Second Anglo-Sikh War began. The Sikhs had this time won over their old foes, the Afghāns, to their cause by holding out to them the city of Peshāwār as a bait.

By this time Lord Dalhousie had resolved to meet openly the Sikh national challenge. He declared on the 10th October, 1848: "Unwarned by precedent, uninfluenced by example, the Sikh nation has called for war, and on my word, sirs, they shall have it with a vengeance." Lord Gough crossed the Rāvī with a British army on the 16th November and had an indecisive engagement with Sher Singh at Rāmnagar on the Chenāb. The Sikhs then entrenched themselves in a stronger position at Chiliānwālā, where a terrible battle was fought on the 13th January, 1849. The Sikhs "of all arms" fought desperately, and contested the field bravely. The British at last won a "Pyrrhic" victory at a high cost. Of their soldiers 602 were killed and 1,651 were wounded, and the colours of three regiments and four of their guns were captured. The Sikhs lost some brave soldiers and twelve guns. Better success, however, attended English arms at Multān, the citadel of which was stormed on the 22nd January, 1849. Mulrāj, after being tried by a military court, was transported for life beyond the seas, where he soon

expired. The news of British losses at Chiliānwālā gave rise to bitter criticisms against Lord Gough, both in India and England, and the Court of Directors appointed Sir Charles Napier to supersede him. But before the latter reached India, Lord Gough had been able to inflict a crushing defeat on the Sikhs and their Afghān allies, on the 21st February, 1849, at Gujarāt, a town near the Chenāb, where they had shifted themselves from their strong entrenched position at Chiliānwālā, owing to lack of supplies. In the battle of Gujarāt, which "was essentially an artillery action and is known as the battle of the guns", the Sikh soldiers fought as before with resolute courage but were defeated through lack of efficient leadership. "No troops could have fought better," remarks Malleson, "than the Sikhs fought, no army could have been worse led." The Sikhs suffered immense losses and their defeat was complete, leaving no chance of further resistance. The British loss was comparatively small. Only 69 were killed and 670 wounded; and their victory was decisive. The battle of Gujarāt, observed the Governor-General, "must ever be regarded as one of the most memorable in the annals of British warfare in India; memorable alike from the greatness of the occasion, and from the brilliant and decisive issue of the encounter". On the 12th March, Sher Singh, Chatter Singh and all the Sikh chiefs and soldiers laid down their arms, and the Afghāns were chased by Sir Walter Gilbert to the Khyber Pass and Kābul.

It was no longer possible for the Sikhs to preserve their independence. On the 30th March, 1849, Lord Dalhousie, on his own responsibility, annexed the Punjab by a proclamation, against the wishes of Sir Henry Lawrence and Lord Ellenborough and also of the Cabinet. He declared: "However contrary it may be to our past views and to our present views, annexation of the Punjab is the most advantageous policy for us to pursue. I firmly believe we shall not succeed in establishing a friendly Sikh power." There is no doubt that the Governor-General's bold policy secured a valuable advantage to the British Empire in India by pushing its frontiers to "the natural limits of India, the base of the mountains of Afghānistān". The unfortunate young Dalip Singh had to suffer for the sins of others, and had to rest content with a pension of five lacs of rupees a year. Sent to England with his mother, Rānī Jhindān, he ultimately embraced Christianity and lived for a time as an English landowner in Norfolk. He subsequently came back to the Punjab and returned to his old faith but not to his old position. Rānī Jhindān died in London.

The success of arms in establishing British political supremacy in the Punjab was supplemented by the administrative measures

of a band of able British officers like Sir Henry Lawrence, his brother John Lawrence, Herbert Edwardes, John Nicholson, Richard Temple, and many others, who, under the supervision of the Governor-General, introduced reforms in various branches of administration, such as the army, the police, justice, land revenue, industry, agriculture, etc. The Governor-General at first constituted a Board of three, consisting of Sir Henry Lawrence, as its President, his brother, John Lawrence, and Charles G. Mansel, who had to make room for Robert Montgomery in 1851. But in 1853 the Board was abolished, Sir Henry Lawrence was sent to Rājputāna as agent to the Governor-General, and John Lawrence was made the first Chief Commissioner of the Punjab. The Sikhs henceforth became loyal to the British Empire and served its cause faithfully during the Second Anglo-Burmese War and the Revolt of 1857–1859.

4. Afghānistān and the Company

A. The Durrānī Menace and British North-West Frontier Policy

From 1757, or more definitely from the year 1765—when, after the English victory at Buxār (22nd October, 1764), the defence of Oudh, situated on the north-west frontier of Bihār, became a matter of vital necessity and fixed policy to the English in Bengal—till the close of the eighteenth century, the dread of Durrānī invasion constantly haunted the minds of British statesmen in India. The Company's Government in Calcutta apprehended an Afghān dash upon Oudh and then upon Bengal. As a matter of fact, a collision between the Afghāns, aiming at political supremacy in Hindustān on the wreck of the Mughul Empire, and the English, trying for the same object, lay almost in the logic of history, as was the case with the Marātha-Afghān clash of 1761. It was fortunate for the English that Ahmad Shāh Abdālī, after his victory at Pānīpat, was prevented from pushing further east owing to troubles at home. There was an ebb-tide in the fortunes of the Durrānīs after the death of Ahmad Shāh Abdālī in June, 1773, and his weak and indolent son and successor, Tīmūr Shāh (1773–1793), could not pursue the vigorous policy of his predecessor.

But Tīmūr's fifth son and successor, Zamān Shāh, who ascended the throne of Kābul in May, 1793, was an able and ambitious ruler. After having suppressed the forces of disorder at home, he advanced to Lahore in 1798 and cherished the dream of invading the interior of Hindustān like Nādir Shāh and Ahmad Shāh Abdālī. Though the project of Zamān Shāh was treated "very lightly" by some of

his contemporaries, and most of the modern writers have pointed out the impossibility of its then being carried into effect in view of the changed political circumstances, the Company's Government in Bengal could not consider "the idea of an invasion from Cabul as a mere visionary danger". Zamān Shāh received invitations from Tipu Sultān, Wāzīr 'Ālī, then trying to organise a conspiracy against the Company, and Nāsir-ul-mulk, the discontented Nawāb of Bengal. In fact, the prospect of Zamān Shāh's invasion of Hindustān "kept the British Indian Empire in a chronic state of unrest" during the administrations of Sir John Shore and Lord Wellesley. Dundas, President of the Board of Control, being confirmed "in the belief of his (Zamān Shāh's) hostile designs", instructed Lord Wellesley "to keep a very watchful eye upon the motions of that Prince, whose talents, military force, and pecuniary resources, afford to him the means of being a formidable opponent". The Governor-General maintained a large British force in Oudh, under Sir J. Craig, to protect that kingdom against the apprehended Afghān invasion, and claimed to have averted it by sending two missions in 1799 to Persia, whose relations with Afghānistān were then strained. The first mission was that of Mehdi 'Ālī Khān, a naturalised Persian then acting as the Company's Resident at Bushire, and the next that of Captain John Malcolm. Persian friendship was also necessary for the English, to counteract the Asiatic designs of France; and the missions of Wellesley proved successful from both points of view. The Persian pressure compelled Zamān Shāh to return from Lahore to Peshāwār, to the immense relief of the English. This is clear from Lord Wellesley's letter to the Secret Committee in London, dated the 28th September, 1801. Harassed by revolts at home, due chiefly to the strife between the Sadozāis (members of the royal family) and the Barakzāis under Payendah Khān and his eldest son, Fateh Khān, Zamān Shāh was ultimately overthrown and blinded and fled to Bukhārā, then to Herāt and finally to India, where at Ludhiānā he survived for many years under pathetic conditions as a pensioner of the British Government, which had once been so much perturbed by the threat of his invasion.

B. Chronic Troubles in Afghānistān after Zamān Shāh

The removal of Zamān Shāh was followed by a period of chronic troubles and disorder in the kingdom of Afghānistān. His brother, Mahmūd Shāh, the next ruler (1800–1803), became a puppet in the hands of the Barakzāi chief, Fateh Khān, and proved himself

utterly incompetent to suppress disorders in Kābul. In 1803 Shujā Mīrzā, a grandson of Ahmad Shāh Durrānī, seized the throne of Kābul. But Shāh Shujā also proved himself incapable of establishing an efficient rule. "His resources were limited, and his qualities were of too negative a character to render him equal to the demands of such stirring times. He wanted judgment; and above all, he wanted money." By the middle of the year 1809, he was defeated by the Barakzāis, the partisans of Mahmūd Shāh, who was thus restored to the throne of Afghānistān. After some fruitless attempts "to splinter up his broken fortune" Shāh Shujā reached Ludhiānā in 1816 to remain there under British protection like his brother, Zamān Shāh. Mahmūd Shāh, a tool in the hands of the Barakzāis, gradually grew impatient of their control, and caused their leader, Fateh Khān, to be killed most cruelly in 1818. This made the Barakzāis furious, and they in the course of a few years brought under their control the whole country of Afghānistān, except Herāt, where Mahmūd Shāh and his son, Kāmrān, found refuge and acknowledged the suzerainty of Persia. Kāmrān continued to hold Herāt after the death of Mahmūd in 1829.

C. Dost Muhammad

In the meanwhile, Dost Muhammad, an able member of the Barakzāi clan, had made himself king of Kābul in 1826 and had been proclaimed Amīr with all the necessary formalities. More courageous and active than his contemporaries, Dost Muhammad frustrated an attempt of Shāh Shujā to regain Kābul in 1833 with the support of Ranjit; but about the same time Peshāwār was captured by the Sikhs owing to the support they received from Dost Muhammad's brother, Sultān Muhammad Khān. In fact, Dost Muhammad's position was beset with dangers on all sides. "On the north there were revolts in Balkh; on the south one of his brothers was holding out against him at Kandāhār; on the east he was harassed by Ranjit Singh at Peshāwār with Shāh Shujā and the British Government in the background; on the west there was Mahmūd Shāh and Kāmrān at Herāt, with Persia plotting behind and Russia lurking in the distance." All this naturally made Dost Muhammad eager for friendship with the English. Thus after the arrival of Lord Auckland (1836–1842), as the Governor-General of India in March, 1836, Dost Muhammad sent him a congratulatory letter in the month of May and sought British help against the Sikhs and Persia. But the Governor-General declared the unwillingness of the British Government to interfere in the affairs of other States.

To put diplomatic pressure on the British Government, the Amir of Afghānistān made overtures to Persia and Russia.

The course of European politics exercised at this time, as it had done before, since the middle of the eighteenth century, a profound influence on the history of Asia. From the early years of the nineteenth century, Russia was actuated by designs of expansion in the East, for which she concluded the Treaty of Gulistān with Persia in 1813. For the time being England succeeded in detaching Persia from her friendship with Russia, and signed the Treaty of Teheran with the former on the 25th November, 1814, according to which "all alliances between Persia and European nations hostile to Great Britain were made null and void, and all European armies were to be prevented from entering Persia, if hostile to Great Britain". But in the course of a few years, the new Shāh of Persia, Muhammad Mīrzā, son of 'Ābbās Mīrzā, who had died in the autumn of 1833, turned out to be a friend of Russia, and Russian influence became predominant at the Persian court. Russia, "making a cat's-paw of Persia", instigated the Shāh to besiege Herāt (November, 1837, to September, 1838), which occupied a position of strategic importance from the standpoint of the interests of the British Indian Empire. "Near Herat," writes Sir T. H. Holdich, "there exists the only break in the otherwise continuous and formidable wall of mountains which traverse Asia from the Bering Strait to the Caspian Sea. Near Herat it is possible to pass from the Russian outposts . . . to India without encountering any formidable altitude—and this is possible nowhere else." The heroic defence of the Afghāns, aided by the courageous efforts of a young British officer, Eldred Pottinger, who was then travelling in Afghānistān, baffled the Persian attempt on Herāt. It served, however, to deepen the ever-increasing British anxiety about Russian ambitions in Asia.

D. The First Anglo-Afghān War

It would undoubtedly have been difficult for Russia to realise her Asiatic ambitions from distant Moscow, and to advance on the frontier of the British Indian Empire by traversing the frowning plateau of Afghānistān and then by defeating the trained army of the Punjab, whose ruler was a British ally. Nevertheless the movements of Russia alarmed British statesmen. They largely influenced Lord William Bentinck's policy towards the Amīrs of Sind and created much uneasiness in the mind of Lord Auckland, especially when the Amīr

of Afghānistān, annoyed with the English for their refusal of help against the Sikhs, had begun negotiations with Persia and Russia. This "Russophobia" also deeply stirred the Whig Cabinet of Lord Melbourne in England. The enterprising Foreign Secretary, Lord Palmerston, saw in Russian designs "imminent peril to the security and tranquillity" of the Indian Empire, and goaded on the Government of India to take effective steps to checkmate them. The Secret Committee of the Court of Directors wrote to the Governor-General on the 25th June, 1836, to "judge as to what steps it may be proper and desirable . . . to take to watch more closely, than has hitherto been attempted, the progress of events in Afghānistān and to counteract the progress of Russian influence in a quarter which, from its proximity to our Indian possessions, could not fail, if it were once established, to act injuriously on the system of our alliances and possibly to interfere even with the tranquillity of our own territory. The mode of dealing with this very important question, whether by despatching a confidential agent to Dost Muhammad of Kābul merely to watch the progress of events, or to enter into relations with this chief, either of a political or merely, in the first instance, of a commercial character, we confide to your discretion, as well as the adoption of any other measures that may appear to you desirable in order to counteract Russian advances in that quarter, should you be satisfied from the information received from your agents on the frontier, or hereafter from Mr. McNeill, on his arrival in Persia, that the time has arrived at which it would be right for you to interfere decidedly in the affairs of Afghānistān. Such an interference would doubtless be requisite, either to prevent the extension of Persian dominion in that quarter, or to raise a timely barrier against the impending encroachments of Russian influence".

On the strength of this despatch, the Governor-General sent Alexander Burnes from Bombay to Kābul in November, 1836, under the pretence of a commercial mission, but in reality, as Burnes himself says, "to see into affairs and judge of what was to be done hereafter". Burnes reached Kābul on the 20th September, 1837. Dost Muhammad, who obviously preferred the friendship of the English to that of the Russians, expressed his willingness to accept British overtures, provided the British Government agreed to put pressure on Ranjit Singh to restore Peshāwār to him. Burnes also recommended an alliance with the Amīr. But Lord Auckland and his two secretaries, William Macnaghten and John Colvin, turned a deaf ear to his suggestion. The hope of an Anglo-Afghān alliance was thus destroyed, and Burnes' mission having failed, he

left Kābul on the 26th April, 1838. Disappointed in securing British friendship, the Amīr naturally sought Perso-Russian alliance, and the Russian envoy, Viktevitch, who had been hitherto treated "in a scurvy and discouraging manner", was received by him with much favour.

Lord Auckland, who had so recently pleaded the doctrine of non-intervention in the affairs of other States when Dost Muhammad solicited British help in the recovery of Peshāwār from the Sikhs now felt no scruple in taking steps to depose Dost Muhammad and to restore the exiled Shāh Shujā to the throne of Kābul with the help of Ranjit Singh. To carry this resolve into effect, he sent Macnaghten, Secretary to the Government, to Lahore, and a Tripartite Treaty was signed between Shāh Shujā, Ranjit Singh and the English on the 26th June, 1838. A war of the English with Afghānistān was a logical outcome of this step. On the 1st October, 1838, the Governor-General issued from Simla a manifesto by way of an official justification of the intended war, in which, as Herbert Edwardes writes, "the views and conduct of Dost Muhammad were misrepresented with a hardihood which a Russian statesman might have envied". "Lies were heaped upon lies" in the Simla manifesto. The Governor-General's remark about Dost Muhammad's "unprovoked attack upon our ancient ally" has been aptly compared by Trotter "for truthfulness with the wolf's complaint in the fable against the lamb".

Lord Auckland's policy is indefensible from all points of view. As an independent ruler of Afghānistān, Dost Muhammad had every right to enlist Perso-Russian alliance on his side however prejudicial it might be to British interests. It should also be noted that Dost Muhammad decided to accept Perso-Russian alliance after the failure of his efforts to secure British friendship. "We had ourselves," observes Kaye justly, "alienated the friendship of the Barakzye Sirdars. They had thrown themselves into the arms of the Persian King, only because we had thrust them off." Further, the poor excuse of Perso-Russian aggression as a danger to British interests ceased to have any force whatsoever after the withdrawal of the Persians from Herāt in September, 1838; this "cut from under the feet of Lord Auckland all grounds of justification and rendered the expedition across the Indus at once a folly and a crime". Politically considered, the Governor-General's policy was ill-advised and inexpedient. Dost Muhammad, whom he wanted to depose, was an efficient ruler having sufficient control over the unruly Afghān tribesmen, whereas his nominee, Shāh Shujā, though possessed of some capacity, had hitherto met with nothing but failure, and

had no prospect of gaining popularity among the Muslims of Afghānistān by being reinstated through the assistance of the Sikhs, the old enemies of the Afghāns, and of the Christian British power. Shāh Shujā was a man "whom the people of Afghānistān had repeatedly, in emphatic, scriptural language, spued out for these Barukzye (Barakzāi) chiefs, who, whatever may have been the defects of their Government, had contrived to maintain themselves in security and their country in peace, with a vigour and a constancy unknown to the luckless Suddozye Princes". In short, the Afghān war was launched, as Kaye pointed out, "in defiance of every consideration of political and military expediency; and there were those who, arguing the matter on higher grounds than those of mere expediency, pronounced the certainty of its failure, because there was a canker of injustice at the core. It was, indeed, an experiment on the forbearance alike of God and of man; and, therefore, though it might dawn in success and triumph, it was sure to set in failure and disgrace". Among the many contemporary critics of Lord Auckland's policy, the Duke of Wellington wrote to Mr. Tucker that "the consequence of crossing the Indus, once, to settle a Government in Afghānistān, will be a perennial march into that country". His remark was prophetic.

Regardless of these considerations, Lord Auckland, largely influenced by his private advisers, John Colvin and W. H. Macnaghten, passed orders to assemble "the army of the Indus" to invade the kingdom of Dost Muhammad. Owing to Ranjit Singh's objection to the passage of the British troops through his kingdom, and certain other reasons, it was arranged that the main British force under the command of Sir John Keane and Sir Willoughby Cotton, accompanied by Shāh Shujā, would advance from Ferozepore to Kābul by way of Bahawālpur, Sind, Baluchistān, and the Bolān and Khojāk Passes over a distance of one thousand miles, while the Sikh army, accompanied by Colonel Wade and Shāh Shujā's son, Tīmūr, would march from the Punjab through Peshāwār and the Khyber Pass. As Dr. Smith observes, "the plan violated all the conditions of sound strategy, and was that of a lunatic rather than of a sane statesman". Further, the march through Sind meant a gross violation of the treaties of 1832 with the Amīrs of Sind. The British army was considerably reduced in numbers through lack of water supply and provisions before it reached Qandahār. Sir W. H. Macnaghten accompanied the expedition in charge of its political affairs with Sir Alexander Burnes as his principal lieutenant.

The allies at first gained successes. Under the supreme command

of Sir John Keane, they occupied Qandahār in April, 1839, stormed Ghaznī on the 23rd July, and Kābul fell into their hands on the 3rd August, 1839, when Dost Muhammad evacuated it. Shāh Shujā was triumphantly enthroned in Kābul without any welcome, or even a "common salaam", from the people. "It was," remarks Kaye, "more like a funeral procession than the entry of the King into the capital of his restored dominions." For a while the British arms seemed to have received additional lustre. But by the end of the year 1841, "that lustre, such as it was, had been lamentably besmirched".

Serious dangers were lurking in the situation. Restored by force of British arms and Sikh help, Shāh Shujā failed to evoke national sympathy and support; and "it was necessary still to hedge in the throne with a quickset of British bayonets" even after Dost Muhammad had surrendered himself in 1840 and had been sent to Calcutta as a prisoner. But the British army was maintained in Afghānistān at a huge cost, entailing a heavy drain on the resources of India; and its presence there increased the prices of the articles of common consumption, which affected the rich as well as the poor people. The popular discontent at foreign domination was aggravated by lapses on the part of the British troops, stationed in the land of the freedom-loving Afghāns. In fact, the system of government imposed on the Afghāns "was becoming a curse to the whole nation".

When Shāh Shujā was not accepted by the nation, it would have been wiser for the British to withdraw with him. Considering the dangers of the situation in Afghānistān, the Court of Directors wisely suggested "the entire abandonment of the country, and a frank confession of complete failure". But Macnaghten, who fondly believed that British prospects were "brightening in every direction" and that everything was "*couleur de rose*", considered the proposal of withdrawal as "an unparalleled political atrocity" and rejected it. Lord Auckland also would not agree to confess the absolute failure of his policy and took recourse to half-measures, which were at once risky and discreditable. The British army of occupation was retained in Afghānistān and an attempt was made to economise by reducing the subsidies of the tribal chiefs of eastern Afghānistān, which alone had so long tempted them to adhere to the English. As a natural result of this "misplaced economy", the chiefs broke out in insurrection in different parts. Two other serious mistakes were committed by the Governor-General. His appointment of General Elphinstone, an elderly invalid, to succeed Cotton in April, 1841, as the commander of the

army in Kābul, against the desire of the Commander-in-Chief, who preferred Nott, the commander at Qandahār, was a calamitous step. It was also unwise on his part to permit Shāh Shujā to use the citadel of Kābul, known as the Bala Hissār, for his seraglio, while the troops were badly placed in ill-fortified cantonments outside the city at a distance from the commissariat stores. Further, Sikh help for the British ceased to be forthcoming owing to the prevailing disorders in the Punjab, after the death of their friend, Ranjit Singh, on the 27th June, 1839.

Disturbances broke out by the autumn of 1841. On the 2nd November a howling mob pulled Alexander Burnes out of his house, murdered him, his brother Charles, and also Lieutenant William Broadfoot. The English officers, civil as well as military, and the troops betrayed a regrettable lack of promptness and ability, and thus allowed "the little fire" to grow "by sufferance into a wide conflagration", under the leadership of Akbar Khān, son of Dost Muhammad. They quarrelled among themselves and failed to realise the formidable nature of the outbreak. "There appears to have been," comments Thornton, a contemporary writer "an almost unanimous determination to shut the ears against all intimations of danger, and indulge in a luxurious dream of safety equal to that within the Marātha ditch." On hearing of these disasters, Lord Auckland was greatly perturbed. He realised rather too late the folly of wrestling "against the universal opinion, national and religious", and became eager "to consider in what manner all that belongs to India may be most immediately and most honourably withdrawn from the country". The feeble General Elphinstone allowed the stores depots to be captured by the insurgents without striking a blow; and Macnaghten, the irresolute British political officer in Afghānistān, fearing to be starved out, concluded a humiliating treaty with Akbar Khān on the 11th December. It was agreed that the British forces should evacuate Kābul as soon as possible, that Dost Muhammad should return to Kābul, and that Shāh Shujā should either remain in Afghānistān on a pension or should go to India with the British army. But Macnaghten, far from being sincerely disposed to observe these terms, entered within a few days into objectionable negotiations with the rival Ghizālī and Qizilbāshī chiefs. He was paid back in his own coin for this unwise act, as these chiefs betrayed him, inveigled him into an interview with Akbar Khān on the 23rd December, and slew him with one of his companions, Captain Trevor; his two other companions, Lawrence and Mackenzie got off with their lives but were made prisoners.

Macnaghten's successor, Major Eldred Pottinger, wanted to break off all negotiations with the Afghāns and either to occupy the Bala Hissār and hold out till help came or to proceed to Jalalābād which was bravely defended by Sale. But Elphinstone and other military officers, who had not the courage to stand and vindicate their national honour, disregarded his suggestions and stooped to make more concessions. They surrendered guns, muskets and ordnance stores and ratified the treaty on the 1st January, 1842. On the 6th January, the "crouching, drooping and dispirited" British troops and camp-followers, 16,500 men in all, set out on their return journey towards India, struggling through the stinging snow of the winter and a constant shower of bullets from the Afghāns, whose fanatical rage Akbar Khān was unable to check. Within a few days the women and children and some officers, including Pottinger, Lawrence and Elphinstone, were given to Akbar Khān as hostages. But the slaughter of British troops continued and on the 10th January only about a quarter of the force was left. In the pithy phrase of Roberts, "the retreat became a rout, the rout a massacre." Thus considerably thinned, the retiring troops made the last desperate stand at the Pass of Jagdalak on the 11th January only to lose twelve of their officers. Of the 16,500 men that had started from Kābul a week before, all were destroyed excepting 120 prisoners under Akbar Khān, and only one, Dr. Brydon, reached Jalalābād, severely wounded and utterly exhausted, on the 13th January, to narrate the painful story of the tragic retreat.[1] The gallant defence of Qandahār by Nott and Rawlinson, and of Jalalābād by Sale and Broadfoot, may be considered as the only streak of light in the enveloping darkness of disaster. Naturally shocked and mortified by these calamities, Lord Auckland tried to conceal his lack of foresight by describing the terrible catastrophe in the General Order issued on the 31st January as "a partial reverse", which afforded "a new occasion for displaying the stability and vigour of the British power, and the admirable spirit and valour of the British-Indian army". He made some ill-fated efforts to retrieve British prestige, but was soon compelled to leave his office, and Lord Ellenborough (1842–1844) took charge of it on the 28th February, 1842.

[1] There is, however, a reference in Macdonald's letter, dated the 17th June, 1842, to an account in the Journal of the Serjeant of the 37th Native Infantry, who was an eye-witness of the events that happened from the date of the departure of Elphinstone's force from Kābul till its final destruction, and made his escape to Jalalābād. "It is a far better account than Brydon's, who seems scarcely yet to have recovered his reason, which in his fright he certainly lost for the time being." *J.I.H.*, August, 1933.

There is no doubt that the Afghān War was an unjust proceeding on the part of the Company's Government in India, and as such it merited, in the opinion of some writers, the "tremendous Nemesis" which overtook it. Kaye significantly observes: ". . . the wisdom of our statesmen is but foolishness, and the might of our armies is but weakness when the curse of God is sitting heavily upon an unholy cause." Further, the feeble and unwise manner in which it was conducted made its failure inevitable. In critically examining the causes of the British reverses and disasters in connection with the Afghān War, Captain Trotter remarks that "the utter collapse of that (Lord Auckland's) policy, baleful, lawless, and blundering as it was, sprang mainly from the choice of agents ill-fitted for their work. Macnaghten's cheery trustfulness, Elphinstone's bodily and mental decay, Shelton's stupid wilfulness, chronic dissensions between the civil and military powers, Sale's withholding of timely succour, all conspired with Lord Auckland's half-measures and ill-timed economies, to work out the dramatic Nemesis of an enterprise begun in folly and wrong-doing".

E. Lord Ellenborough (1842–1844) *and Afghān Affairs*

In view of the overwhelming disaster of the late Afghān War, Lord Ellenborough declared in a letter to the Commander-in-Chief, written on the 15th March, 1842, that the British Government would no longer "peril its armies and with its armies the Indian Empire" to support the Tripartite Treaty, but would aim at the establishment of its military reputation "by the infliction of some signal and decisive blow upon the Afghāns". He changed this resolution, however, on hearing the news of General England's defeat at Hakalzāi and Palmer's surrender of Ghaznī, and ordered the immediate withdrawal of the British troops that still remained in Afghānistān, without thinking any longer of reprisals or of releasing the prisoners. This order fell on the army, as Outram recorded, "like a thunder-clap" and raised a storm of indignation both in England and India. Shāh Shujā had meanwhile been murdered. Both Nott and Pollock showed no disposition to retire but maintained their positions, pleading want of transport as a reason for their hesitation to withdraw. Lord Ellenborough at last "discovered a way to maintain a particularly empty show of consistency, and at the same time to satisfy the universal demand for the decisive reconquest of Kābul and recovery of the prisoners as a preliminary to withdrawal". On the 4th July

he sent letters to Nott and Pollock repeating the order for withdrawal from Afghānistān, but at the same time gave Nott wide discretion to retire to India, not by the Bolān Pass, but by Ghazni and Kābul through the Khyber, and also ordered Pollock to act in concert with Nott in this matter of retreat. It is clear that the Governor-General thus threw the responsibility for decision on the generals, who, however, accepted it without any hesitation. On the 20th August, Pollock started from Jalalābād with 8,000 of his choice troops; defeated the Afghāns at Jagdalak on the 8th September and at Tezin on the 13th September, reached Kābul on the 15th September and once more hoisted the British flag at the Bala Hissār. On the 17th September he joined Nott, who had already destroyed the town and fortifications of Ghaznī on the 6th September and had, according to the instructions of Lord Ellenborough, carried away the "so-called gates of Somnāth", which Sultān Mahmūd was supposed to have carried off in the eleventh century. The English prisoners were rescued; but "the glory of the avenging army at Kābul was marred by acts of barbarity" when it blew up the great bāzār of Kābul with gunpowder and the city was ruthlessly sacked, many inoffensive people being subjected to great suffering, before it was evacuated on the 12th October. The returning army was welcomed by the Governor-General at Ferozepore with "triumphal arches and histrionic paeans of victory". In a proclamation issued from Simla on the 10th October, though it was dated the 1st October, Lord Ellenborough denounced in strong language the policy of his predecessor and expressed his willingness "to recognise any government approved by the Afghāns themselves, which shall appear desirous and capable of maintaining friendly relations with neighbouring States". In another bombastic proclamation, addressed to the princes, chiefs and people of India, the Governor-General announced: "Our victorious army bears the gates of the temple of Somnāth in triumph from Afghānistān and the despoiled tomb of Sultān Mahomed looks upon the ruins of Ghaznee. The insult of 800 years is avenged."

The unwisdom and uselessness of the second proclamation can hardly be doubted. "The folly of the thing," observes Kaye, "was past all denial. It was a folly, too, of the most senseless kind, for it was calculated to please none and to offend many." It wounded the feelings of the Muslims; and the Hindus remained indifferent about the gates, which, as the antiquarians rightly held, had been built much later than the eleventh century "of no wood more precious than deal or deodar". The Governor-

General's "glorious trophy of a successful war" was in the end consigned to a lumber-room in the fort of Āgra, and he made himself subject to ridicule and censure, though he was powerfully supported by the Duke of Wellington and Lord Hardinge. Dost Muhammad was allowed to reoccupy his throne unconditionally, and he held it till his death, at the age of eighty, in 1863. His friendly attitude towards the English and opposition to Persia showed that the "whole disastrous episode", which cost no less than 20,000 human lives and fifteen millions of money, was "entirely superfluous".

5. The Annexation of Sind

The Afghān War was very closely connected with the conquest of Sind, which followed it. Sind embraced the lower valley of the Indus and was included within the empire of Ahmad Shāh Durrānī. But, during the closing years of the eighteenth century, it owed only a nominal allegiance to Afghānistān and was governed in practical independence by the Mīrs or Amīrs of the Tālpurā tribe, which, coming originally from Baluchistān, had overthrown the last of the Kalorās in A.D. 1783. The three important branches of the Tālpurā chiefs were seated at Hyderābād, Khairpur and Mīrpur.

The English had had commercial interests in Sind for a long time; a factory established by them at Thātta in 1758 was abandoned in 1775 and their commercial mission to the Tālpurā Mīrs in 1799 produced no important result. With a view to excluding French influence from Sind, the British Government concluded a treaty with the Amīrs of Sind in 1809, which was renewed in 1820. The journey of Alexander Burnes in 1831 up the river Indus on his way to Lahore disclosed to the English the importance of Sind from the political as well as commercial point of view, and since then its absorption into the growing British Empire had been only a question of time. "Alas," observed a Seiad, "Sind is now gone since the English have seen the river." As we shall see, this proved wholly true as a prophetic prediction.

Sind had an ambitious neighbour in the Sikh ruler, Ranjit Singh, who coveted it as a natural sphere of expansion for his empire. But his attempts were thwarted by his friends, the English, who in their turn lost no opportunity of increasing their influence over that territory. Thus in 1831 Lord William Bentinck opposed Ranjit Singh's proposal for a partition of Sind. But the Amīrs of Sind had to conclude a treaty with the British Government, rather reluctantly, on the 20th April, 1832, which provided that "the rivers and roads" of Sind should be opened to the

"merchants and traders of Hindoostan", but that no "military stores" and "armed vessels or boats" should come through these. As a sort of precaution against the apprehended absorption of their territory by the British, the Amīrs took care to include another stipulation to the effect that "the two contracting powers bind themselves never to look with the eye of covetousness on the possessions of each other". This treaty was renewed in 1834. Up to 1838 Ranjit Singh often contemplated the incorporation of Sind into his empire, but was thwarted by the English, who now with a view to strengthening the ties by which the Amīrs of Sind were "connected with the British Empire", proceeded to extort from them favourable terms as a reward for their protection against Sikh aggression. By a treaty concluded on the 20th April, 1838, Lord Auckland forced on them an accredited British Resident. In fact, Sind soon fell out of the frying-pan into the fire. Sikh ambition in regard to it could not be realised, but it was to pay a high price for the uncalled-for British protection by being deprived of its independence through questionable means adopted by British officers.

On the outbreak of the First Anglo-Afghān War, the English, in violation of the treaty of 1832, took an armed force through Sind, and informed the Amīrs that "while the present exigency lasts . . . the article of the treaty (of 1832) prohibiting the use of the Indus for the conveyance of military stores must necessarily be suspended". Greater humiliation and loss were inflicted on the Amīrs when Lord Auckland demanded from them a heavy sum as a price for unsolicited British mediation in effecting a commutation of the pecuniary demands of Shāh Shujā on Sind. The Amīrs, who had stopped the payment of any tribute to Shāh Shujā during his thirty years' exile and had also been granted an exemption by Shāh Shujā in 1833 from all claims, naturally hesitated to comply with Lord Auckland's demand. But they were given a warning to the effect that the British Government had the "power to crush and annihilate them, and . . . will not hesitate to call it into action, should it appear requisite, however remotely, for either the integrity or safety" of the Empire, or its frontiers. The Amīrs had no other option but to submit to the Governor-General's exaction. Further, the threat of Sir John Keane's march on the capital of Sind compelled them to accept fresh terms from Lord Auckland in February, 1839, by which they were bound to pay a sum of three lacs of rupees per annum for the maintenance of a British force in their territories, and Sind was "formally placed under British protection". This treaty was

again revised by Lord Auckland and his advisers in their own way and was sent back for final signature to the Amīrs, who "objected, implored and finally gave way, by affixing their seals to the revised documents".

A worse fate was, however, in store for Sind. She had been intimidated and coerced by Lord Auckland; but his successor went further and imposed on her the yoke of British authority by sheer force. During the critical years of the disastrous Afghān War, the province had been utilised as a base of operations by the British Government, and its Amīrs had remained steadfastly loyal to their agreements with the English. But far from being duly rewarded for their attachment, the Amīrs were unjustly charged with disaffection and hostility against the British Government by Lord Ellenborough, who sought a convenient pretext to give effect to his design of annexing Sind. To make matters easy for himself, the new Governor-General removed Major James Outram, the Resident at Hyderābād, who had some experience of local affairs, and sent to Sind Sir Charles Napier with full civil and military powers as a representative of the Governor-General. Sir Charles Napier, a hot-headed and impulsive officer, who came to Sind on 10th September, 1842, acted on "the theory that the annexation of Sind would be a very beneficent piece of rascality for which it was his business to find an excuse—a robbery to be plausibly effected". He took it for granted that the vague charges against the Amīrs had been proved, and, besides arbitrarily interfering in a succession quarrel at Khairpur, dictated a new treaty by which the Amīrs were required to cede certain important territories in lieu of the tribute of three lacs, to provide fuel for British vessels navigating the Indus, and to give up the right of coining money in favour of the British Government. He did not stop with these demands, which amounted to an absolute surrender of national independence by the Amīrs, but acted as if Sind had already become a part of the British Empire and "as though the right of the Governor-General of British India to parcel it out at his pleasure was unquestioned and unquestionable; and, moreover, as if it were desired to exercise this right in a manner as offensive as possible to those who were to suffer privation from the exercise". Thus before the acceptance of a fresh treaty by the Amīrs, he occupied the territory in question, and issued proclamations in strong language. Further, while talking of treaties, he sought to intimidate the Amīrs by marching upon Imāmgarh, a famous desert fortress lying between Khairpur and Hyderābād, without formally declaring war, and destroying it early in January, 1843.

These high-handed acts of Napier sorely tried the patience of

the warlike Baluchis, and in a state of excitement they attacked the British Residency on the 15th February, 1843, whereupon Outram, who had returned to Sind as a British Commissioner, fled for refuge to a steamer. Thus war was now openly declared. A Baluchi army of about 22,000 men was defeated on the 17th February at Miāni, a few miles from Hyderābād, by Napier fighting with 2,800 men and 12 guns. This was followed by the immediate submission of some of the Amīrs, but Sher Muhammad, "the Lion of Mīrpur", still held out bravely. He was, however, thoroughly vanquished on the 24th March at Dabo, six miles from Hyderābād, whereupon Napier occupied Mīrpur on the 27th March, Amarkot on the 4th April and conveyed the news of his victory to Lord Ellenborough in the punning message, "Peccavi", i.e. " I have Sind". Sher Muhammad was driven out of Sind in June and the war came to a close. Sind was formally annexed to the British Empire in August, 1843, and the Amīrs were exiled. Napier unhesitatingly accepted £70,000 as his share of the prize money, while Outram, in spite of being a man of comparatively small resources, did not take his own share amounting to £3,000 but gave it to some charitable institutions. Outrām, in fact, had no liking for Napier's policy and wrote to him: "I am sick of policy; I will not say yours is the best, but undoubtedly it is the shortest—that of the sword. Oh, how I wish you had drawn it in a better cause!"

The policy of Lord Ellenborough, and the high-handed acts of Sir Charles Napier, with regard to Sind, have been justly condemned by most writers. There is no doubt that they acted on purely imperialistic motives and resorted to highly objectionable means, by cynical violations of treaty obligations, to reduce the Amīrs, who had inflicted no injury on the British, to a state of vassalage. "If the Afghān episode," observes Innes, "is the most disastrous in our annals, that of Sind is morally even less excusable." While trying to defend the policy by various laboured arguments, which are at once irrational and unhistorical, Napier has admitted in his Diary: "We have no right to seize Sind, yet we shall do so, and a very advantageous, useful, humane piece of rascality it will be." Strangely enough, the Court of Directors, while condemning the policy of annexing Sind, did nothing to undo the wrong. Napier was appointed the first Governor of Sind, and he tried hard during his rule of four years to consolidate British authority in the province.

CHAPTER VI

THE COMPANY AND THE MINOR INDIAN STATES (1774–1858)

1. Early Relations, 1774–1823

THE rapid strides with which British imperialism had advanced in India since at least the time of Wellesley, if not earlier, inevitably affected the destiny of the Indian States that had arisen on the ruins of the Mughul Empire. Their relations with the Company's Government varied according to changing political conditions and the personal views and ambitions of the Governors-General; but the "conviction which developed with Wellesley and continued up to our own time, that the government of the whole of India directly or indirectly by the British is part of a preordained system" had a considerable influence in shaping British policy towards the Indian States. Warren Hastings, confronted with the task of safeguarding British territories against the encroachments of the Marāthas, and the militant rulers of Mysore, adopted the policy of a "*Ring-Fence*", that is, sought to guard the frontiers of the neighbouring States by way of precaution. But some of his transactions, such as his demands on Chait Singh of Benares and the Begams of Oudh, and conduct towards Faizullā Khān of Rāmpur, involved breach of treaties or betrayed a lack of moral scruples. The subsidiary treaties of Lord Wellesley established in fact British predominance over some of the Indian States. But in theory these States did not thereby become subject to British paramountcy as they retained their independence in matters of internal administration. All the treaties of Wellesley, except that with Mysore, were negotiated on terms of equality. Being, however, dependent on the Company for self-protection, States like Oudh, the Carnatic and Tanjore began to suffer from all the evils of "double government" like those which had distracted Bengal since 1765. It was Lord Hastings who transformed the treaties of "reciprocity and mutual amity" into those of "subordinate co-operation", and established British paramountcy over most of the Indian States by compelling them to surrender their sovereign rights of making war or peace and negotiating agreements with other powers. Formally, these States retained

internal sovereignty, but in actual practice they were subject to frequent interference in the affairs of internal government by British Residents, the quality and amount of this interference varying with the difference in "personality and temperament" of the officers concerned. Lord Hastings was not, however, "an annexationist".

2. Relations between 1823 and 1858

The period intervening between the departure of Lord Hastings and the outbreak of the Revolt saw the weight of British influence falling more heavily on the Indian States, owing on the one hand to the growing executive and controlling authority of the British Residents in the sphere of internal administration of these States, and on the other to the frank enunciation of the policy of annexation by the British Government. This policy of annexation, formulated by the Court of Directors as early as 1834, and more clearly emphasised by them in 1841, was applied vigorously in the time of Lord Dalhousie. It was the outcome of two motives on the part of the Company's Government, namely those of extending British political influence by incorporating new territories into the Empire and of securing greater facilities for the transport of merchandise and the collection of revenues. Both were intended to tighten the hold of British Paramountcy over India.

Lord William Bentinck was tied to the policy of "let alone" by the authorities in England, when he came to India. But he departed from it drastically in some cases and his masters also enunciated the policy of annexation in the course of a few years. Thus in 1831 he took over the administration of Mysore, which had been misgoverned by Rājā Kṛishṇa Udaiyar and consequently fell into disorder; the Rājā was pensioned off and the Mysore administration remained in the hands of the British Government till 1881. Bentinck also absorbed some other States into the British Empire. The principality of Cāchār, where the royal line had come to an end on the death of its last ruler, was annexed in August, 1832, as the British Government did not accept as valid the claims of any candidate for the vacant throne. The lands of the Rājā of Jaintiā in Assam were incorporated in the British Empire in March, 1835, as the new ruler refused to accept the stringent terms imposed on him. Viraraja the younger, king of Coorg, was accused of monstrous cruelties towards his subjects and secret conspiracy against the British. Although these charges were not supported by any positive evidence, and later proved to be mostly unwarranted or false, British forces were sent to Coorg and it was annexed by a formal

proclamation dated the 7th May, 1834. Thus minor Indian States were annexed on pretexts which will not stand any serious examination. Lord Auckland, whose energies were preoccupied with the Afghān War, could not pay much attention to the States, but he annexed the territory of the Nawāb of Karnul, in Madras, on suspicion of his hostile designs against the British Government.

His successor, Lord Ellenborough, had to deal with a formidable outbreak in Gwālior. At the close of the Marātha War of 1817–1819, Gwālior had remained under Daulat Rāo Sindhia as the most powerful Indian military State south of the Sutlej. Daulat Rāo died in 1827, when one of his youthful relatives, Jankojī Rāo Sindhia, was installed as the Rājā with an ambitious woman, Mahārānī Baiza Bāī, widow of Daulat Rāo Sindhia, as the regent. The weakness of the new ruler, and the activities of the regent, gave rise to various intrigues and disorders in the State, which did not end even when the latter was expelled in 1833. In the midst of these troubles Jankojī died in 1843 without issue. A minor named Jayajī Rāo was then raised to the *Gadi*; but intrigues and counter-intrigues quickly multiplied, especially through the machinations of two rival parties over the selection of a regent for the boy king. The Governor-General's candidate, Krishna Rāo Kadam, the Māmā Saheb or the maternal-uncle of the deceased ruler, was removed from office by the youthful widow of the late ruler, who preferred the appointment of Khasgi-wālā. As is natural during civil strife in a State, the Gwālior army, 40,000 strong, became restless, which caused anxiety in the mind of the Governor-General. The latter feared that the combination of this army with the Khālsā army, about 70,000 strong, in the Punjab, where also a civil war was about to break out after the assassination of Sher Singh, would prove to be a serious menace to the British Government. Haunted by this fear, Lord Ellenborough assumed a dictatorial attitude, and even though the Gwālior authorities accepted all his demands, which were unjust and unreasonable in the extreme, he personally led an army into the territory of Sindhia. Not unnaturally, the Gwālior troops keenly resented this insult to their master, and advanced to oppose the British forces. But they were defeated on the 29th December, 1843, in two engagements—one at Mahārājpur, north of Gwālior, by Sir Hugh Gough, and the other at Paniar, by General Grey. Gwālior, now reduced definitely to the status of a protected State, was placed under a Council of Regency, which was to manage its affairs during the minority of the Mahārājā subject to the control of a British Resident. The army was cut down to 9,000 men and a

British contingent of 10,000 men was placed there. Curiously enough, during the Revolt, the Gwālior army under the command of Dinkar Rāo, minister of the State, supported the English, while the Company's contingent there rose against them.

The Governor-Generalship of Lord Dalhousie was marked by a stupendous growth of the British Empire at the expense of many of the Indian States. Lord Dalhousie annexed a large number of States in pursuance of what is known as the "Doctrine of Lapse", which means that, on the failure of natural heirs, the sovereignty of the "dependent" States, of those created by the British Government, or held on a subordinate tenure, lapsed to the Paramount Power, a position which, it was agreed, the British Government had acquired after the fall of the Mughul Empire; it also did not acknowledge the right of those States to adopt heirs, which had been a long-standing practice among the Hindus, without the consent of the suzerain authority. The doctrine did not apply to "protected *allies*". Referring to the glaring abuses in the government of some of the Indian States, the Governor-General declared that the British Government "in the exercise of a wise and sound policy is bound not to put aside or neglect such rightful opportunities of acquiring territory or revenue as may from time to time present themselves, whether they arise from the lapse of subordinate states by the failure of all heirs of every description whatsoever, or from the failure of heirs natural where the succession can be sustained only by the sanction of the government being given to the ceremony of adoption, according to Hindu law. The government is bound, in duty as well as in policy, to act on every such occasion with the purest integrity, and in the most scrupulous observance of good faith. When even a shadow of doubt can be shown, the claim should at once be abandoned". It is true that the principle applicable to adoption, and the policy of annexation, were not invented by Lord Dalhousie. Both of these had been asserted by the Court of Directors earlier since 1834 and had been applied in some cases. We have already noted earlier instances of annexation; as for the "Doctrine of Lapse" it had already been applied to Mandavī in 1839, to Kolābā and Jalāūn in 1840, and to Surāt in 1842. But there is no doubt that Lord Dalhousie advocated and applied the principles most vigorously. "There was," observes Innes, "fully adequate precedent for every one of his annexations. But his predecessors had acted on the general principle of avoiding annexation if it could be avoided; Dalhousie acted on the general principle of annexing if he could do so legitimately."

The States that were absorbed into the British Empire according

to the Doctrine of Lapse were Sātārā in 1848, Jaitpur and Sambalpur in 1849, Baghat, a Cis-Sutlej hill State, in 1850, Udaipur in 1852, Nāgpur in 1853, and Jhansī in 1854. It should be noted that the distinction between "dependent" States and "protected allies" was very subtle; and it is doubtful if all these States could be rightly regarded as "dependent" ones. The kingdom of Sātārā was a British creation in the sense that, after the fall of the Peshwā in 1818, it had been given by Lord Hastings to a member of the house of Shivājī. In 1839 the Rājā was deposed on a charge of misgovernment and his brother was raised to the *Gadi*. The latter having no issue adopted a son, before his death in 1848, without consulting the Governor-General or the British Resident. Lord Dalhousie, supported by all his leading colleagues, considered this adoption to be invalid and declared that the State of Sātārā lapsed to the sovereign power. The Court of Directors also agreed with his view as "being in accordance with the general law and custom of India". Nāgpur also had fallen under British control in 1818, but Hastings had bestowed it on a member of the old ruling house. The Rājā died in 1853, leaving no lineal descendants or adopted son. Dalhousie annexed it on the ground of its being a creation of the Company. Whatever might have been the legal position of Sātārā and Nāgpur in relation to the British Government, it is clear that Dalhousie's motives in annexing them were purely imperialistic. It has been admitted even by Lee-Warner, a strong apologist of Dalhousie, who writes that with regard to Sātārā and Nāgpur "imperial considerations weighed with him . . . they were placed right across the main lines of communication between Bombay and Madras and Bombay and Calcutta". Further, the disposal of the State funds and treasures of Nāgpur by public auction, which has been characterised by Kaye in his *Sepoy War* as "spoliation of the palace", was certainly an undignified and tactless measure. Jhansī, a district of Bundelkhand, was given to the English by the Peshwā in 1818, and the English placed a ruler on its throne on terms of "subordinate co-operation". On the death of its last ruler in November, 1853, leaving no issue but only an adopted son, Dalhousie annexed it. A part of Sikkim, about 1,676 square miles, was taken over by the Company in 1850 as a punishment on its chief for capturing the representative of the British Government and ill-treating two British subjects. Sambalpur was annexed to the British Empire in 1849 on the death of its ruler Nārāyan Singh without any heir. Lord Dalhousie's decision with regard to Baghat and Udaipur was reversed by Lord Canning; and the Court of Directors did not approve of his proposal

for the annexation of Karauli in Rājputāna, on the ground that it was a "protected ally" and not a "dependent" State.

The principle of lapse was also applied to sweep away the titles and pensions of the rulers of some States, on the ground that "appearances without the reality of authority were sure to shake Native confidence" in the "good faith" of the Company. Thus on the death of the Nawāb of the Carnatic in 1853, Lord Dalhousie decided not to recognise any one as his successor. Similarly, when the Rājā of Tanjore died in 1855, leaving behind him only two daughters and sixteen widows, the Governor-General abolished the Rājāship of this State for good. He wanted also to abolish the title of the nominal Delhi Emperor, in which, however, he was not supported by the Court of Directors. On the death of the ex-Peshwā, Bājī Rāo II, in 1853, the pension of eight hundred thousand rupees, which had been granted to him by Sir John Malcolm, was not allowed by Lord Dalhousie to be paid to his adopted son, Dundu Pant, later on known as Nānā Sāheb, on the ground that the pension had been a personal allowance of his adoptive father and so could not pass on to his successor. This measure has been described by Kaye as "harsh" and by Arnold as "grasping". The Nizām of Hyderābād in the Deccan was in arrears with the payment of a British contingent, which he was not actually obliged to maintain by the terms of his treaty with the British. Dalhousie nevertheless coerced him into making territorial cessions for the regular payment of the "Hyderābād Contingent". By an arrangement made in May, 1853, the cotton-producing province of Berar was given to the Company in lieu of the subsidy.

Besides conquest and lapse, the maxim of "the good of the governed" was also enunciated by the British Government in annexing some States whose administrations were "fraught with suffering to millions". The case of Oudh is the most typical example of the application of this maxim. Since Lord Wellesley's treaty of 1801, Oudh had been kept as a "protected feudatory State" with control over internal administration. It was indeed an unwise arrangement, under which the ruler of Oudh was invested with responsibility without power, and its natural consequence was that the administration of the State degenerated terribly, to the great suffering of its people. The British Government realised the evils of Oudh administration, and successive Governors-General, especially Lord William Bentinck and Lord Hardinge, warned its ruler; but none did anything to remedy the fundamental defect of the subsidiary system, which by guaranteeing British protection to the

ruler of Oudh made him unmindful of the real interests of the State and saved him from "justifiable revolt on the part of his subjects". The growing deplorable situation in Oudh, to which the attention of the British Government was drawn, more clearly than before, by Colonel Sleeman, Resident in Oudh from 1848 to 1854, and his successor, Colonel Outram, both of whom were opposed to the policy of lapse, convinced the Governor-General of the necessity of the adoption of a bolder policy with regard to Oudh. The existence of the ill-governed State of Oudh, almost in the centre of the rapidly expanding British Empire in India, could not but appear to the architects of the latter as a gross anachronism, which should be removed as quickly as possible to facilitate their own task. There could be no better or more convenient pretext than to hold out the prospect of good government, for the absorption of a kingdom whose subjection to British control dates back to the time of Warren Hastings. Lord Dalhousie was inclined to solve the Oudh problem not by annexing it but by merely taking over its administration and by allowing its ruler to retain only his palace, rank and titles. But the Court of Directors ordered its complete annexation, which was formally proclaimed by Outram on the 13th February, 1856. Wāzid 'Alī Shāh, the last ruler of Oudh, was deported to Calcutta, where he had to spend his last days on an annual pension of twelve lacs of rupees.

The annexation of Oudh was an instance of territorial aggrandisement which was "not warranted by international law", as Dalhousie himself expressed it in his letter to Sir George Couper, dated 15th December, 1855. It should be noted that for the misgovernment of Oudh, which was utilised as the ground for its annexation by the Company, then eager to consolidate its possessions in India, the responsibility lay mainly on the English, who had thrust upon that kingdom the impolitic arrangement of the subsidiary system and had unceasingly interfered in its affairs. "The facts furnished by every writer on Oudh affairs, all testify," Sir Henry Lawrence stated, "to the same point, that British interference with that province has been as prejudicial to its court and people as it has been disgraceful to the British name." Further, no consideration was shown for the unflinching loyalty of the ruling house of Oudh to the British Government. It has also been held by some that the annexation of Oudh meant a "gross violation of national faith" involving disregard of an old treaty. In 1837 Lord Auckland had concluded an agreement with the ruler of Oudh, which bound him either to introduce reforms or to make over the administration to the British Government while

retaining the sovereignty. Though this treaty was not sanctioned by the Court of Directors, Lord Auckland intimated to the Oudh ruler the disallowance of only one clause of it and, somehow or other, "the treaty was actually included in a subsequent Government publication and was referred to as still in force by succeeding Governors-General". When the Court of Directors decided on annexing Oudh, the British Government suddenly informed the ruler of Oudh that the treaty of 1837 was "a dead letter".

CHAPTER VII

THE INDIAN REVOLT OF 1857–59

1. Presages of the Revolt

THE rapid expansion of the British dominion in India, attended as it was by changes in the administrative system and modes of existence to which the people had been accustomed through long ages, disturbed the placid currents of Indian life and produced commotions in different parts of the country. Mention may be made, in this connection, of the Bareilly rising of A.D. 1816; the Cole outbreak of 1831–1832, and other minor risings in Chota Nāgpur and Palāmu; the Muslim movements like the Ferazee disturbances at Barāsat (Bengal) in 1831 under the leadership of Syed Ahmad and his disciple, Meer Niser 'Ālī or Titto Meer, and later in 1847 at Faridpur (Bengal) under the guidance of Deedoo Meer; the Moplah outbreaks in 1849, 1851, 1852, and 1855; and the Santāl insurrection of 1855–1857. These risings testify to the general ferment in the British Empire in India, the last and the most severe being the Revolt of 1857–1859, which shook its mighty fabric to its very foundations.

2. Causes of the Revolt

The Revolt was the outcome of the changing conditions of the time; and its causes may be conveniently summed up under four heads—political, economic and social, religious, and military. The political causes had their origin in Dalhousie's policy of annexation, the doctrine of lapse or escheat, and the projected removal of the descendants of the Great Mughul from their ancestral palace to the Qutb, near Delhi. All this naturally gave rise to considerable uneasiness and suspicion in the minds of the old ruling princes, Muslim as well as Hindu. The annexation of Oudh, and the idea of doing away with the bedimmed splendour that still surrounded the Mughul Emperor, wounded Muslim sentiments; and the refusal to continue the pension of the ex-Peshwā, Bājī Rāo II, to his adopted son, Nānā Sāheb, agitated some Hindu minds. As a

matter of fact, some of the discontented rulers and their friends were conspiring against the Company's government even before the Revolt. The more important among them were Ahmad Ullah, an adviser of the ex-King of Oudh; Nānā Sāheb; Nānā Sāheb's nephew, Rāo Sāheb, and his retainers, Tāntiā Topi and 'Azīmullah Khān; the Rānī of Jhansī; Kunwār Singh, the Rājput chief of Jagadishpur in Bihār, who had been deprived of his estates by the Board of Revenue; and Fīrūz Shāh, a relation of the Mughul Emperor, Bahādur Shāh.

The expropriation of some landlords by the British Government, and the growing unemployment among the followers and retainers of the dispossessed princes, gave rise to acute economic grievances and social unrest in different parts of the country. The resumption of rent-free tenures by Bentinck no doubt secured for the State increased revenue but at the same time it reduced many of the dispossessed landlords to a state of indigence. During the five years before the outbreak of the Revolt, the Inam Commission at Bombay, appointed by Lord Dalhousie to investigate the titles of landowners, confiscated some 20,000 estates in the Deccan, without considering or a moment that such a drastic measure was sure to create complications in the economic condition of the country. In Oudh especially, there prevailed terrible bitterness of feeling, particularly after Sir James Outram was succeeded as its Chief Commissioner by Coverly Jackson, a man of unsympathetic attitude and overbearing disposition. The King's stipendiaries and officials ceased to have their allowances and pensions; his capital was occupied by the new Chief Commissioner; and the disbandment of his army deprived the professional soldiers of their means of livelihood. All these converted Oudh, "the loyalty of whose inhabitants to the British had become proverbial, into a hot-bed of discontent and of intrigue". Matters were to some extent improved by the recall of Jackson and the appointment of Henry Lawrence; but discontent could not be completely allayed.

The conservative sections of the Indian population were alarmed by the rapid spread of Western civilisation in India during the closing years of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth. They saw in inventions like the railway and the telegraph, in the extension of Western education, in the abolition of practices like *Satī* and infanticide, in the protection of the civil rights of converts from Hinduism by the Religious Disabilities Act of 1856, in the legalisation of widow remarriage by the Hindu Widows Remarriage Act of 1856, and in the unwarranted aggressive spirit of some Christian missionaries,

attempts on the part of the Government to destroy their social polity, to westernise their land at the cost of their time-honoured customs and practices and to convert India to Christianity. The activities of the Wahhābī sect must have contributed to inflame the feelings of the Muslims.

Thus several factors generated fumes of discontent in different parts of the country, the bursting of which into a devouring flame would not, however, have been possible if the Sepoy Army had remained, as before, loyal to the Company. "In the control of the Sepoy Army lay," observes Innes "the crux of the position." But, for several reasons, the attitude of the Sepoys towards the Company had become by this time far from friendly. Frequent engagement in prolonged campaigns in distant lands, which the Sepoys disliked, had severely tried their loyalty. Some regiments of Sepoys had already mutinied on four occasions, during the thirteen years preceding the outbreak of 1857, as their demands for extra allowances for fighting in remote regions had not been met by the Company's government: the 34th N.I. in 1844, the 22nd N.I. in 1849, the 66th N.I. in 1850 and the 38th N.I. in 1852. Further, the discipline of the Sepoy Army, especially of the Bengal Division, had been rapidly deteriorating, owing largely to the defective policy of the Government which unwisely transferred able military officers from the field to political jobs and retained the rule of promotion by seniority, irrespective of any consideration of age or efficiency. General Godwin, for example, commanded in the Second Burmese War at the age of seventy. The so-called "Bengal Army" was recruited not in Bengal proper, but from high-caste men in Oudh and the North-Western Provinces. Being very sensitive about their caste privileges they were not easily amenable to discipline and also shared the general suspicion as to the westernising and Christianising policy of the Government. The feeling of discontent was intensified by Lord Canning's General Service Enlistment Act ordering all recruits to the Bengal Army to be ready for service both within and outside India. The disparity in numbers between European and Indian troops had become glaring during the recent years; thus at the time of Lord Dalhousie's departure from India, the former numbered 45,322 and the latter 233,000. The distribution of the troops was also defective. Places of strategic importance like Delhi and Allahābād were wholly held by the Sepoys; and between Calcutta and Allahābād there was only one British regiment at Dināpore near Patna. Again, England was then engaged in several extra-Indian wars like the Crimean War, the Persian War and the Chinese War, which sorely taxed her resources. A belief was engendered in the

minds of the Sepoys that England was in a critical situation and that, the British Army in India being so small, the safety of her Indian Empire depended on the Sepoys. "A consciousness of power," wrote the Commissioner of Meerut, "had grown up in the army which could only be exorcised by mutiny, and the cry of the cartridge brought the latent spirit of revolt into action." The introduction of the Enfield rifle, the cartridges for which were greased with animal fat, was indeed an ill-considered measure. It set the spark that enkindled the embers of discontent, which was being fanned sedulously among the army by Nānā Sāheb, the partisans of the King of Oudh, the Rānī of Jhansī and a few others. There were some grounds for the belief of the Sepoy Army that the grease was made from cow or pig fat, obnoxious to both the Hindus and the Muslims. "On this inflammable material," writes Atchison, "the too true story of the cartridges fell as a spark on dry timber," and the whole country from the Sutlej to the Narmadā was ablaze.

3. The Outbreak of the Revolt and Its Suppression

The first signs of unrest appeared early in 1857 at Bārrāckpore and Berhampore in Bengal; they were, however, quickly suppressed and the culprits were punished. But the Sepoys broke out into open revolt at Meerut on the 10th May, 1857, swarmed into the prisons, released their imprisoned comrades, murdered a few European officers and burnt their houses. General Hewitt, the incapable commanding officer at Meerut, although he had 2,200 European troops under him, took no steps to suppress the mutineers, who galloped the next morning to Delhi, where not a single British regiment was stationed at that time, and brought it under their control. They massacred many Europeans and destroyed their houses. Two signallers in the telegraph office, outside the city, warned the authorities in the Punjab in time by sending them a telegraphic message. Lieutenant Willoughby, the officer in charge of the magazine, defended it for a few days with his eight brave companions, but at last finding himself overwhelmed he blew it up. This caused great losses to the mutineers, who, however, soon occupied the palace and proclaimed the aged nominal king, Bahādur Shāh II, whose name still conjured up to many the vanished glories of the once mighty Mughul Empire, Emperor of Hindustān. The loss of Delhi, which had fallen into British hands as a result of much hard fighting and diplomacy, dealt a severe blow to the prestige of the British Empire.

There was a comparative respite of about three weeks, during which Sir John Lawrence, the Chief Commissioner of the Punjab, managed to keep that province tranquil. But before any attempt could be made to recover Delhi, insurrections broke out by the first week of June in almost all the upper Gangetic provinces and parts of Central India—at Nāsirābād in Rājputāna, at Bareilly in Rohilkhand, at Cawnpore, at Lucknow in Oudh, at Benares and in certain parts of Bihār. The Bihār movement under the leadership of the brave Rajput hero Kunwār Singh of Jagadishpur near Arrah was put down for the time being by William Tayler, Commissioner of the Patna Division, and Major Vincent Eyre of the Bengal Artillery in August, 1857.

But leaving Bihār after this Kunwār Singh moved from place to place outside fighting against the English and returned here again in April, 1858, to fight his last battle with them before his death on the 23rd April, 1858. There were outbreaks also in other parts of Bihār and, after the death of Kunwār Singh, his brother, Amar Singh, was the acknowledged leader of the movement in this area. The Benares outbreak was suppressed by Colonel Neill of the 1st Madras Fusiliers, who put to death all the mutineers who could be captured; and in the surrounding districts that were placed under martial law by the Governor-General, "rebels, suspects, and even disorderly boys were executed by infuriated officers and unofficial British Residents, who volunteered to serve as hangmen". The famous fort of Allahābād, defended bravely by Captain Brasyer with a small Sikh force, was relieved on the 11th June by Neill. The mutineers became very active at Cawnpore, Delhi and Lucknow. But, fortunately for the English, the regions south of the Narmadā were not on the whole affected by the revolt though there were discontent and unrest at some places. Lord Elphinstone preserved comparative tranquillity in the Bombay Presidency, though an Indian regiment mutinied at Kolhapur, and George Lawrence was able to keep Rājputāna very quiet. The Punjab and particularly its Sikh chiefs, Gulāb Singh of Kāshmīr, and many zamindārs and Indian officers, remained loyal to the Company. Valuable services were rendered by some famous Indian rulers and statesmen, like Sindhia and his minister, Sir Dinkar Rāo, Sir Salar Jang, the minister of Hyderābād, the Begam of Bhopāl and Sir Jang Bahādur, the able minister of Nepāl, to arrest the spread of the movement. In the opinion of Innes, Sindhia's loyalty "saved India for the British"; and Holmes, well known for his important work on the history of the Indian Mutiny, has described Sir Salar Jang as "a man whose name deserves to

be ever mentioned by Englishmen with gratitude and admiration".

The mutineers at Cawnpore were led by Nānā Sāheb, who had been living at Bithur near Cawnpore and had proclaimed himself as Peshwā. They invested the British entrenchments, which had been hurriedly constructed, in a manner too inadequate for effective defence, by Sir Hugh Wheeler, the seventy-five-years-old commander of that station. From the 8th till the 26th of June, the invested garrison, consisting of about four hundred men capable of bearing arms and a number of women and children, defended themselves bravely in the midst of dreadful suffering and privation. They surrendered on the 27th, being given assurances of safe conduct to Allahābād. But as the deluded British garrison were leaving the place in boats, a murderous fire was opened on them at the Satichaura Ghat with the result that most of the men were massacred at the river-side, only four being able to escape. A large number of women and children were confined in a building, known as the Bibigarh, where they were mercilessly put to death on the 15th July by Nānā's troops and their bodies were flung into a well. Nānā has been held guilty for this massacre. He pleaded that he was not aware of it. But "until it is conclusively proved that he had no knowledge of it, he cannot be absolved of the charge of connivance and must share the obloquy and opprobrium of that shameful act".[1] It is difficult to say definitely how far these atrocities were perpetrated as a reprisal for the repressive measures of British and Sikh soldiers at Benares and Allahābād. The results of the Cawnpore massacre were very lamentable. It aroused a burning desire for revenge in the minds of Englishmen, both in India and England, and led the Company's troops to perpetrate acts that have left very unpleasant memories. An avenging British force under Havelock reached Cawnpore one day after the tragic incident. Neill, appointed Brigadier-General next in rank to General Havelock, arrived at Cawnpore on the 20th July. The city was occupied by the mutinous Gwālior contingent on the 27th and 28th November, but Sir Colin Campbell recovered it on the 6th December.

The recovery of Delhi, the important rallying centre of the insurgents, could not but engage the serious attention of the British Government. On the 8th June a relieving British force from Ambālā, joined by a party from Meerut, defeated a mutinous army at Badli Sari and took up a position on the famous Ridge overlooking the city of Delhi. Additional reinforcements, including

[1] S. N. Sen, *Eighteen Fiftyseven*, p. 159.

a number of Sikhs, were sent from the Punjab by Sir John Lawrence, under a brave officer named Nicholson, to join the British troops on the outskirts of Delhi. Nicholson frustrated an attempt of the opposing force to intercept his advance, and assisted by Sir Archdale Wilson, Baird Smith and Neville Chamberlain, delivered a vigorous assault on the mutineers. On the 14th September, the Kāshmīr Gate was blown up, and the city and the palace were captured after six days' desperate fighting. Nicholson received a mortal wound. The city was sacked by British soldiers, and in the process many of its innocent male citizens were slaughtered. The famous Urdu poet, Ghalib, who was then at Delhi, mournfully wrote: "Here there is a vast ocean of blood before me, God only knows what more I have still to behold." The *Bombay Telegraph* reported: "All the city people found within the walls when our troops entered were bayoneted on the spot; and the number was considerable, as you may suppose when I tell you that in some houses forty or fifty persons were hiding." The titular Delhi Emperor, Bahādur Shāh II, was arrested at the tomb of Humāyūn by Lt. Hodson, a fierce cavalry officer, and his sons and a grandson surrendered to Hodson as prisoners of war. Bahādur Shāh II was deported to Rangoon, where he spent his last years in exile, till he died in 1862, at the age of eighty-seven. The princes were shot down by Hodson, who had persuaded himself that they had been guilty of murdering Englishmen and women and that they would be rescued by a mob before he could take them to a place of safety. Thus came to an end the Mughul imperial dynasty. There is no doubt that Hodson's act was "most uncalled-for". The charges against the victims were not proved by any definite evidence, nor was any attempt made by the crowd to save them. Malleson observes that "a more brutal or a more unnecessary outrage was never committed. It was a blunder as well as a crime".

At Lucknow, the revolt broke out on the 30th May, and Sir Henry Lawrence, who had succeeded Mr. Jackson as Chief Commissioner, retired at the beginning of July to the Residency, with all the Europeans and Christians and about 700 loyal sepoys, and held out there only for a few days, as he was shortly afterwards killed by the bursting of a shell. The command of the besieged garrison then fell on Brigadier Inglis, who bravely defended the place against numerous assaults until Havelock and Outram fought their way at the point of the bayonet into the Residency on the 25th September with much-needed reinforcements. General Neill died at this time at Lucknow. Inglis, Havelock and Outram could not make their way out with the besieged garrison. Their final relief

was effected by the middle of November by Sir Colin Campbell (afterwards Lord Clyde), who came from England as Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Army in August, 1857.

Sir Colin Campbell took vigorous action to suppress the risings in Oudh and Rohilkhand. With the valuable help of Jang Bahādur of Nepāl, who joined him at the head of a powerful Gurkhā contingent, he finally brought Lucknow under British control on the 21st March, 1858. But the Tālukdārs of Oudh had been infuriated by a singularly injudicious proclamation, issued by Canning at the end of March to the effect that the lands of all the Tālukdārs were liable to forfeiture "except those of six specifically mentioned and of others who could prove their loyalty". They carried on a guerilla warfare. The capture of Bareilly in Rohilkhand in the month of May greatly disheartened them and they were thoroughly vanquished by the end of the year. Many of the insurgents fled across the British frontier to Nepāl, to perish there miserably.

Meanwhile, the insurgents in Central India had found an able leader in Tāntiā Topi, a Marātha Brāhmana, who with the mutinous Gwālior contingent, 20,000 strong, crossed the Jumnā at Kalpi, joined the troops of Nānā Sāheb, and repulsed General Windham, who had been left in charge of Cawnpore. But he was defeated, and driven out, on the 6th December, 1857, by Sir Colin Campbell. Tāntiā Topi then joined Rānī Lakshmī Bāī of Jhansī and carried on a desperate fight in Central India. Meanwhile Sir Hugh Rose had been conducting successful campaigns in Bundelkhand, the southernmost centre of the rising. Marching from his base of operations at Mhow early in January, 1858, he relieved the garrison at Saugor, captured Hatgarh early in February, defeated Tāntiā Topi on the Betwā River, and stormed Jhansī on the 3rd April. Leaving the fort of Jhansī during the night of the 4th April, the Rānī went with a few followers to Kalpi, which also was captured by the English on the 22nd May. The indomitable Rānī and Tāntiā Topi then marched to Gwālior, and drove out Sindhia to Āgra. This prince had remained loyal but his army now deserted him. Nānā Sāheb was proclaimed as the Peshwā. Realising the danger of a Marātha rising, Sir Hugh Rose took prompt measures to check the activities of the Rānī and Tāntiā. He recovered Gwālior after defeating the insurgents at Morar and Kotah. The Rānī of Jhansī, dressed in male attire as a *sowār*, died a soldier's death in one of these battles on the 17th June, 1858. Tāntiā Topi, chased from place to place, was given up to the English, early in April, 1859, by Mān Singh, a feudatory of Sindhia, and was hanged on charges of rebellion and murder and not for complicity in the massacre of Cawnpore.

as is often stated. Nānā Sāheb was driven into the jungles of Nepāl and is said to have died there in September, 1859, according to a report of Jang Bahādur and some other reports. But various exciting tales and rumours about his return to India and also movements outside continued to be in circulation for many years. The principal leaders of the movement found their way to Nepāl. The ladies of the Peshwā's family could spend their last days there. Begam Hazrat Mahal of Oudh also decided to stay there with her son and a small retinue. Thus ended the episode of the Revolt, and Canning proclaimed peace throughout India. Many people, both in India and England, demanded the pursuit of a "ruthless and indiscriminate policy of vengeance". Even Nicholson spoke for legalising "the flaying alive, impalement, or burning of the murderers of the women and children at Delhi". But Canning, uninfluenced by this clamour, judged the matter with statesmanlike prudence and cool judgment, and arranged for the proper trial and punishment of those only who were really guilty. For this he was described, in derision, as "Clemency Canning"; but it must be admitted that the Governor-General's policy was wise and expedient and he was right in opposing measures whose only effect would have been to add to the bitterness of feeling between the rulers and the ruled.

4. Causes of the Failure of the Revolt

The Revolt, though an outbreak of a formidable nature, failed owing to the defective equipment and organization of the insurgents. Firstly, their military equipment was inferior to that of the English; for example, their old muzzle-loaders were outranged by the newly invented breech-loaders of the English troops. Secondly, while many of the insurgents failed to understand the significance of contemporary scientific improvements and even dreaded them, the English fully utilised these advantages for their own benefit. Thus with control over a widespread telegraph system and postal communications, the latter were able to receive and exchange information from different parts of the country and to modify their course of action according to the needs of the situation. Thirdly, the English were fortunate enough to secure the loyalty of most of the feudatory chiefs, with the exception of the Rānī of Jhansī, the Begam of Oudh and some minor chiefs; and, as has already been pointed out, they received invaluable assistance from men like Sir Dinkar Rāo of Gwālior, Sir Salar Jang of Hyderābād, Jang Bahādur of Nepāl, and the Sikhs. In the north-west, Dost Muhammad remained friendly. Fourthly, the insurgents could not secure the unstinted

and universal support of the civil population in all parts of the country, many of whom were alienated by the confusion and disorder which followed the risings and involved them in considerable suffering and loss. Fifthly, there was absence of a carefully concerted general plan or a strong central organisation for guiding the movement. Lastly, there was a comparative lack of efficient leadership among the insurgents, while the British cause was ably served by a number of wise and brave leaders like Lawrence, Outram, Havelock, Nicholson, Neill and Edwardes. It should also be noted that the English by clever diplomacy succeeded in securing for themselves the support of the Sikhs and the Pathans who had been lately their enemies.

5. Nature and Effect of the Revolt

The Revolt was not a thoroughly organised national movement or "a war of independence", as James Outram, a contemporary, believed it to have been, or as it has been represented by some modern writers. Nor was it a mere military rising. It started as a military outbreak, which was taken advantage of by certain discontented princes and landlords, whose interests had been affected by the new political order. The last-mentioned factor gave it in certain areas the character of a popular rising and constituted a menace to the British Empire for several months, particularly in Bihar, Oudh and Rohilkhand. In fact, it gradually developed in these areas as a "general revolt"[1] in which sections of "the civil population of all types and classes",[2] who were discontented due to various reasons, took part and which was "the first great and direct challenge to British rule in India on an extensive scale".[3] It was never all-Indian in character, but was localised, and in certain respects restricted and poorly organised. Only one of the three provincial armies mutinied; and all the Indian sepoys did not rise against the British Government. As we have already noted, important Indian princes and chiefs sided with the English; and of the thousands of landlords, recently dispossessed of their property, only the Tālukdārs of Oudh actively helped the insurgents. There was no leader of outstanding ability among the mutineers, except the heroic figure of the Rānī of Jhansī, whom Sir Hugh Gough esteemed as "the best and bravest military leader of the rebels". Further, the movement was marked by absence of cohesion and unity of purpose among the different sections of the insurgents. Unfor-

[1] R. C. Majumdar, *Sepoy Mutiny* (new edition), p. 394.
[2] R. C. Majumdar, *History of the Freedom Movement in India*, Vol. I, p. 112.
[3] R. C. Majumdar, *Sepoy Mutiny*, p. 485.

tunately, it was characterised by a disregard of the rules of civilised warfare on both sides, and "was fought with peculiar savagery". If the mutineers were guilty of terrible enormities the British troops also on occasions tarnished the fair name of their country by a severity that was hardly tempered by good sense or moderation.

For more reasons than one, the Revolt marks a turning-point in the history of India. In a sense it demonstrated that the hold of the Company on India was still rather weak, and its lessons continued to influence British administration in India for several generations. "I wish," remarked the late Lord Cromer, "the young generation of the English would read, mark, learn and inwardly digest the history of the Indian Mutiny; it abounds in lessons and warnings." It directly produced three important changes in the system of administration and the policy of the Government.

Firstly, the control of the Indian Government was finally assumed by the Crown, in spite of protests from the Company. An Act for the Better Government of India was passed on the 2nd August, 1858, which provided that "India shall be governed by, and in the name of, the Sovereign through one of the principal Secretaries of State, assisted by a council of fifteen members". At the same time the Governor-General received the new title of Viceroy. This was, however, "rather a formal than a substantial change", because the Crown had been steadily increasing its control over the affairs of the Company since the latter had become a territorial power in India, and the actual control had been exercised so long by the President of the Board of Control, who was a Minister of the Crown. The Directors had functioned as a mere advisory council.

The assumption of the government of India by the Sovereign of Great Britain was announced by Lord Canning at a darbār at Allahābād in a Proclamation issued on 1st November, 1858, in the name of the Queen. The Queen's Proclamation, described as the Magna Charta of the Indian people, confirmed the treaties and engagements of the East India Company with the Indian princes; promised to respect the rights, dignity and honour of the native princes and to pay due regard to the ancient rights, usages and customs of India; disclaimed all desire for the extension of British territorial possessions in India through "encroachment on those of others"; granted a general amnesty to "all offenders, save and except those who have been, and shall be convicted of having directly taken part in the murder of British subjects"; proclaimed

a policy of justice, benevolence and religious toleration, enjoining the Government to "abstain from all interference with the religious belief or worship" of the subjects; and declared that all "of whatever race or creed, may be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified, by their education, ability and integrity, duly to discharge".

Secondly, the army, which took the initiative in the outbreak, was thoroughly reorganised; and, for the next fifty years, "the idea of division and counterpoise" dominated British military policy in India. The Presidency armies were kept entirely separate till 1893; the European element in them was strengthened, and placed in sole charge of some essential services; and the number of European soldiers was increased. The Commission on Indian Army Organisation of 1879 observed: "The lessons taught by the Mutiny have led to the maintenance of two great principles, of retaining in the country an irresistible force of British troops and keeping the artillery in the hands of Europeans."

Thirdly, the British Government now took up a new attitude towards the Indian States. These States had henceforth to recognise the paramountcy of the British Crown and were to be considered as parts of a *single charge*.

One indirect effect of the Revolt is clearly seen in the birth and rise of extremism in Indian politics. The excesses of the movement engendered a feeling of hostility in the minds of some Indians as well as some Englishmen in India, which, being aggravated by the growing racial discrimination between the two, has been influencing political thought and administrative policy in India in modern times. Russell, the *Times* Correspondent in India, rightly observed in his *Diary* that "the mutinies have produced too much hatred and ill-feeling between the two races to render any mere change of the rulers a remedy for the evils which affect India, of which those angry sentiments are the most serious exposition. . . . Many years must elapse ere the evil passions excited by these disturbances expire; perhaps confidence will never be restored; and, if so, our reign in India will be maintained at the cost of suffering which it is fearful to contemplate".

CHAPTER VIII

ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANISATION UP TO THE REVOLT

1. The Central Administration

THE virtual acquisition of the kingdom of Bengal by the East India Company raised important problems. Could a private corporation be allowed to rule over vast territories without any supervision of Parliament? Was a constitution designed for carrying on trade and commerce equally suitable for the administration of an oriental Empire? These were the questions that agitated politicians and statesmen in England. They were made party issues in Parliament and were also further complicated by the personal interests which were bound up with them. It is beyond the scope of the present work to trace the history of this interesting problem and its effect upon the parliamentary history of England. Suffice it to say that after a great deal of discussion, frequently characterised by vehement denunciations and personal recriminations, Parliament appointed a Select Committee and a Secret Committee, and at last in 1773 passed the famous Regulating Act which introduced Parliamentary supervision over the Company and modified its constitution both in England and in India.

The Act restricted the power of vote in the Court of Proprietors by raising the qualification for the same from £500 to £1,000. The twenty-four Directors, who had been hitherto elected each year, were henceforth to be elected for four years, one fourth of their number retiring each year.

The Act provided that "the Directors should lay before the Treasury all correspondence from India dealing with the revenues; and before a Secretary of State everything dealing with civil or military administration". Thus the first definite step was taken for providing Parliamentary control over the affairs of the Company. By a Supplementary Act, passed in 1781, all dispatches proposed to be sent to India were to be shown to a Secretary of State.

As regards the administration in India, the main provisions of the Act were as follows:

The Government of Bengal was vested in a Governor-General and a Council of four members. The votes of the majority were

to prevail, the President having a casting vote in case of equality of votes. The first Governor-General, Warren Hastings, and the Councillors, Clavering, Monson, Barwell and Philip Francis, were named in the Act and appointed for five years (the term was further extended by Supplementary Acts). Their successors were to be appointed by the Company. The Governor-General in Council could control the subordinate Presidencies of Bombay and Madras in matters relating to war and peace. Further, the Act authorised the Crown to establish, by royal charter, a Supreme Court of Justice consisting of a Chief Justice and three puisne judges.

The Regulating Act was in force from 1773 to 1784 and thus covered almost the entire administration of Warren Hastings as Governor-General. The effects of the Act may, therefore, be best studied in detail in the events of that period. In general, it may be remarked that the Act broke down almost as soon as it was put to a practical test. The subordination of the Governor-General to a majority of the Council introduced weakness and vacillation in the Central Government, which might have proved fatal to British rule in India. The supervision over subordinate Presidencies was an extremely difficult task, and its impracticable character was demonstrated by the events of the First Anglo-Marātha War. The establishment of the Supreme Court led to endless complications as its jurisdiction was not properly defined, and it naturally came into conflict with the existing courts of law. In England also the ministerial control over the actions of the Directors proved illusory in many notable instances. The whole position has been beautifully summed up in the following sentence:

"It had neither given the State a definite control over the Company, nor the directors a definite control over their servants, nor the Governor-General a definite control over his Council, nor the Calcutta Presidency a definite control over Madras and Bombay."

Immediately after the inauguration of the new regime on 26th October, 1774, Warren Hastings was confronted with the opposition of the majority in his Council. The attitude of the new Councillors was far from friendly from the beginning, and they attacked the Governor-General's policy on various points. Francis, who came to India with a preconceived notion that the administration was honeycombed with abuses and needed radical reforms, was the leading spirit of the opposition against the Governor-General. The virulent and persistent attacks of the Councillors made Hastings powerless in his Council for a few years till the death of Monson on 25th September, 1777, and severely

affected his prestige, with the result that charges of bribery and defalcation were brought against him by his enemies.

This is strikingly illustrated by the case of Nanda Kumār, a Brāhmaṇa of high rank, who had held an important position in the Nawāb's Government (p. 653). On 11th March, 1775, Nanda Kumār, whom Hastings had offended by depriving him of his house and by showing special favour to his foe, Mohan Prasād, the executor of an Indian banker, charged Hastings with taking presents, worth many lacs, among them Rs. 354,105 from Muny Begam, the widow of Mīr Jāfar, for placing her in control of the Nawāb's household. It is very difficult to say definitely whether the charges were true. Hastings unwisely refused to meet the charges and to be put on trial before his Council, with one as prosecutor whom he detested most and considered to be "the basest of mankind". But the Councillors, full of suspicion and dislike for the Governor-General, concluded that the charges against him were true and that he should pay the money into the Company's treasury. In 1776 the law officers of the Company in England declared that these charges, even on the *ex parte* case before them, were false.

Meanwhile, in the month of May, 1775, Mohan Prasād charged Nanda Kumār with forgery in connection with a will executed five years before. He was tried by the Supreme Court and a jury, found guilty, sentenced to death and hanged.

There is no doubt that Nanda Kumār did not receive a fair trial and there was a "miscarriage of justice" at least in respect of the capital punishment inflicted on him. Sir James Stephen states that "if he had to depend upon the evidence called for the prosecution, he would not have convicted the prisoner". Again the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court over the indigenous population was doubtful, and the fact is that "the English law making forgery a capital crime was not operative in India till many years after Nanda Kumār's alleged forgery had been committed". Further, the judges took the unusual course of themselves cross-examining the defence witnesses "and that somewhat severely".

It is sometimes said that the execution of Nanda Kumār "was a judicial murder". It was openly asserted by some at that time that Mohan Prasād was a creature of Hastings, who influenced the judicial decision against the accused. Nanda Kumār wrote to Clavering that he was the victim of a conspiracy between the Governor-General-in-Council and the Supreme Court. But it should be noted that Impey was not the only judge who tried the case and there were also his colleagues and the jury; and that there is no positive evidence to prove Hastings' conspiracy with Impey, with

whom he was not always on good terms. The conduct of the Council in not trying to save Nanda Kumār seems to be rather mysterious. Francis suggested the idea of appealing for a reprieve, but it was opposed by Clavering and Monson. "It casts," observes Roberts, "the darkest and most sinister shadow over the reputation of the men who used him for their own purpose and then callously and contemptuously flung him to the wolves."

In the course of a few years the glaring defects of the Regulating Act became apparent, and fresh attempts were made to devise suitable remedies. The matter was brought to a head in 1783, when the Company was obliged to approach Parliament for financial relief. Burke only voiced the general opinion when he claimed that the relief and reformation of the Company must go together.

The first proposal for reform advocated by Dundas came to nothing. The Bill introduced by Fox was passed in the House of Commons after a long and acrimonious debate, but was defeated in the Lords mainly as a result of the intervention of King George III. Pitt succeeded Fox and introduced a new Bill in January, 1784, and it was passed in August of the same year.

Pitt's India Act established six "Commissioners for the affairs of India", viz. a Secretary of State, the Chancellor of the Exchequer and four Privy Councillors appointed by the King. The body, known popularly as the Board of Control, was to exercise an effective supervision over the Board of Directors. They had access to all the papers of the Company and no dispatches other than those that were purely commercial could be sent without their approval. The power of the Court of Proprietors was considerably reduced, as they could not annul or suspend any resolution of the Board of Directors which was approved by the Commissioners. These Commissioners were also empowered to send urgent or secret orders through a Secret Committee of the Directors, the approval of the latter being of course a mere formality. The supreme authority thus passed into the hands of the Commissioners, and the Directors retained only their patronage, *viz.* the right to appoint and dismiss their own servants.

Important changes were at the same time introduced in the Indian administration. The members of the Governor-General's Council were reduced to three and only the covenanted servants of the Company were made eligible for these posts. The control of the Governor-General in Council over the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay was clearly defined and rendered more effective. By a supplementary Bill, passed in 1786, the Governor-General was

authorised in special cases to act against the majority of the Council, and also to hold the office of Commander-in-Chief.

The constitution set up by Pitt's India Act did not undergo any fundamental change during the existence of the Company's rule in India. We may therefore pass in rapid review the minor changes that occurred between 1786 and 1858. It may be noted that legislative changes during this period were always associated with the renewal of the Company's Charter in 1793, 1813, 1833 and 1853.

As regards the Home Government, the most notable changes were in regard to the Board of Control. Its powers were gradually concentrated in the hands of the President, who thereby virtually became the Cabinet Minister for India.

The Charter Act of 1813 abolished the monopoly of the Company's Indian trade and laid down "the undoubted sovereignty of the Crown" in and over the possessions of the East India Company. The Charter Act of 1833 abolished the trading activities of the Company and henceforth it became a purely administrative body under the Crown.

In India, the powers of the Governor-General over the subordinate Presidencies were further enlarged by the Charter Act of 1793, which enabled him to proceed in person to Madras and Bombay and exercise the same authority over their administration as in Bengal. The Charter Act of 1833 not only gave the Governor-General and Council the superintendence, direction and control over the subordinate Presidencies, but also took away from the latter all powers of making laws, and concentrated all legislative authority in the former. Henceforth, with certain necessary exceptions, the Governor-General and Council could make laws and regulations for all persons, whether British or Indian, and for all courts of justice, whether established by His Majesty's charters or otherwise.

In order to enable the Council to discharge these important functions efficiently, a new member with expert knowledge of law was added to it. The Law Member must not be a servant of the Company and could speak and vote only at meetings of the Council which discussed legislative business.

In order to emphasise the superior role which the Governor-General and Council would play over all the Company's possessions in India, the supreme authority in the country was henceforth designated as the Governor-General of India in Council. The Governor-General in Council also constituted the Government of Bengal, and the Act permitted a member of the Council to be appointed Deputy-Governor of the Province.

The Charter Act of 1853 introduced further changes. The number of Directors was reduced to eighteen, of whom three (later six) were to be appointed by the Crown. It took away from them the power of patronage by instituting an open competitive examination for the recruitment of civil servants. The salary of the President of the Board of Control was made equal to that of a Secretary of State, and the approval of the Crown was necessary for all appointments of Councillors, both central and provincial.

As regards the Government of India, the most important changes concerned its legislative function. The Law Member was made an ordinary member of the Governor-General's Council and no law could be enacted without the assent of the Governor-General. The Council itself was enlarged for legislative purposes by the addition of six new members, called "legislative councillors". These included four nominees of the four provincial Governments (Bengal, Bombay, Madras and the North-Western Provinces) and the Chief Justice and a puisne Judge of the Supreme Court. The nominated members must be civil servants of at least ten years' standing. A Law Commission was appointed in London for the codification of Indian laws, and it ultimately led to the enactment of the Penal Code, the Criminal Procedure Code, and the Civil Procedure Code.

The changes made by the successive Charter Acts merely sought to carry to its logical conclusion the process that had been begun by North's Regulating Act and Pitt's India Act, viz. gradual transference of power and authority from the Company to the Crown. The relation between the two was, throughout this period, a complicated one, and depended to a large extent upon the personality of the President of the Board and his influence with the Cabinet. In addition to initiative, direction and control, a strong President could coerce the Directors into submission in almost every matter, but the latter always possessed, to a large extent, the power of resisting and putting obstacles in his way. The right of recalling the Governor-General was always an important instrument in their hands, and no President would lightly risk their determined hostility and desperate resistance. But the inevitable chain of events pointed to the extinction of the Company as the only logical end. After the Charter Act of 1833 the main privilege and justification for the existence of the Company was the appointment of civil servants—a powerful patronage which could hardly be transferred to the Cabinet without danger to British democracy. With the institution of competitive examination for the recruitment of civil servants, this last vestige of effective

power was gone, and the way was made clear for the abolition of the Company and the transfer of its powers to the Crown. This end was already visualised by many and must have shortly been realised in the ordinary course even if the Revolt had not suddenly brought it about in an abrupt manner.

2. Provincial Administration

Bengal, the First Phase (1765–1793)

Although the Company was granted the *Diwānī* of Bengal, Bihār and Orissa in 1765, the actual collection of revenue was left till 1772 in the hands of two Nāib-Diwāns, Muhammad Rezā Khān in Bengal and Shitab Rāy in Bihār. Out of the revenues collected, the Company had to pay twenty-six lacs to the Emperor, as stipulated in the Treaty of Allāhābād, and thirty-two lacs (originally fifty-three lacs) to the Nawāb of Bengal for the expenses of the administration, retaining the surplus for their own use. This is the famous system of Dual Government associated with the name of Clive.

The result of this system was disastrous both to the Company as well as to the people of Bengal, while the servants of the Company and the Nāib-Diwāns amassed great wealth. The Company's authorities at home were fully alive to the abuses of the system and in 1772 appointed Hastings Governor of Bengal with full powers to reform the administration.

Hastings abolished the Dual Government and carried into effect the declared policy of the Company to "stand forth as the Diwān". In reality, however, he did much more than simply exercise the powers of the Diwān, i.e. collection of revenue by his own agents. He made the Company responsible for almost the entire civil administration of the province.

He abolished the posts of the Nāib-Diwāns and removed the treasury to Calcutta. The minority of the Nawāb made the transition easy. He appointed, as the guardian of the Nawāb, Muny Begam, originally a dancing girl, on whom he could fully rely. The annual allowance of the Nawāb was at the same time reduced to sixteen lacs. These and similar other measures transferred the real power and authority in the administration from the hands of the Nawāb to those of the Company, and Calcutta became henceforth the real seat of government instead of Murshidābād.

After thus having assumed the powers of government, Hastings set himself to evolve a system of administration. The task, however,

proved a most formidable one. The administrative machinery of the Company, so long intended solely for commercial pursuits, had to be adjusted to an altogether different purpose, and the hopeless fabric of the Nawāb's Government could scarcely supply any solid foundation for a new structure. Besides, the morale of the Company's Indian servants was very low, and a tradition of public service had yet to be built up. The ignorance of the language of the people and of their laws, manners and customs added to the difficulty of the task. No wonder, therefore, that the British authorities in Bengal had to pass through long and weary processes and to engage in tedious and bitter experiments in order to find a solution to the stupendous problems that confronted them. The twenty years (1772–1793) that covered the administration of Hastings and Cornwallis may be regarded as the first eventful chapter in the history of Indo-British administration in Bengal. After numerous experiments, some definite principles were formulated towards the close of this period, and they formed the foundation of the mighty structure of the British-Indian administration which we see around us to-day. It would be convenient, therefore, to begin with this period and study the gradual evolution of this administrative system, mainly under the two heads, the administration of revenue and the administration of justice.

A. The Administration of Revenue

The main sources of revenue at this period were:

(*a*) Land-revenue
(*b*) Monopoly of salt and opium trade
and (*c*) Customs, tolls, excise, etc., called *Sair*.

Of these the first was undoubtedly the most important and demands our chief attention. As already noted above, the land-revenue was collected up to 1772 by the two Nāib-Diwāns. This was almost inevitable at the beginning, as the British entirely lacked the knowledge of revenue matters. In order to remove this deficiency "supervisors" were appointed to study the method of collecting the revenue and obtain a knowledge of the local customs and usages in this respect. The requisite knowledge was, however, confined to the zamindārs, who collected the revenues from the ryots, and the Qānūngoes or officers in charge of records. None of these were willing to communicate the information to the British officials and so the appointment of supervisors bore but little fruit.

In 1772 the posts of the Nāib-Diwāns were abolished and the revenue administration was placed under the direct control of the Governor and Council, who thus formed a Board of Revenue. The lands were farmed out by public auction and the assessment was made for a period of five years. A Collector and an Indian Diwān were appointed in each district to supervise the revenue administration.

The result of the system was disastrous from every point of view. Unprincipled speculators made rash bids and succeeded in ousting the zamindārs in most cases, but they soon found themselves unable to collect the stipulated revenue. Having no permanent interest in the land, they oppressed the ryots in order to exact as much as possible during the period of their tenure. In spite of this, they were heavily in arrears and were imprisoned by the Collectors for failure to make the stipulated payment. Thus the zamindārs, farmers and ryots all suffered, while the Company also incurred serious losses.

In 1773 a new experiment was tried. A Committee of Revenue, consisting of two members of the Board and three senior servants of the Company, was established in Calcutta. The post of the European Collector was abolished, and the revenue administration of each district was placed under an Indian Diwān. Six Provincial Councils were established, and arrangements were made for occasional inspection by special Commissioners.

The change did not improve matters much, so that when the five years' settlement expired the Company adopted the method of annual assessment by public auction, but special instructions were issued to the Provincial Councils to give preference to the zamindārs in making these annual settlements of land revenue.

In 1781 a new plan was adopted for the administration of revenue. The essence of the new plan was to centralise the whole business of revenue collection in Calcutta. A new Committee of Revenue was set up, consisting of four members assisted by a Diwān. The Provincial Councils were abolished, and although European Collectors were reappointed in each district, they had no real powers and were merely figureheads.

The scheme suffered from all the evils and abuses of over-centralisation and soon broke down. In 1786 a rational scheme was adopted. Districts were now organised into regular fiscal units, and the Collector in each district was made responsible for settling the revenue and collecting it. At first the whole province was divided into thirty-five districts, but in 1787 the number was reduced to twenty-three. The Committee of Revenue was now reconstituted as a Board of Revenue with a member of the Council

as its President. The duties of the Board were clearly defined and consisted mainly in "controlling and advising the collectors and sanctioning their settlement". A new officer, Chief Sheristādār, was appointed to deal with the detailed records of land-tenure and land-revenue, so that the requisite knowledge might be available to the Government, instead of remaining a secret monopoly of the Qānūngoes.

The system of annual settlement continued till the beginning of A.D. 1790. It was obviously a temporary expedient and recognised as such, but had to be continued as the requisite data had to be collected before embarking upon a system of a more permanent character. The problem was further complicated by the varying theories about the ownership of land. The policy of "assessment for ever", which was the central point in the Permanent Settlement of Bengal, introduced in 1793, had been "vaguely anticipated" by some junior officers of the Company between 1765 and 1793, viz. by Alexander Dow in 1770, by Henry Pattullo two years later, and by Philip Francis in 1776. This idea was present in Pitt's India Act of 1784; during the end of the decade Thomas Law accepted it for his *mukarari* settlements in Bihar, and it received legal sanction in Cornwallis' rules for Decennial Settlement in 1789–90.[1]

The different views on this subject were crystallised into the opposing theories of Grant and Shore, two senior servants of the Company, who had specially applied themselves to the thorny question of land-revenue. Shore maintained that the zamindārs were the proprietors of the land and were only liable to pay a customary revenue to the Government. Grant, on the other hand, was of opinion that the proprietary right of the land was vested in the Government, and they had unrestricted rights to make settlements with anybody, zamindār or farmer, on any terms they liked. The authorities in England adopted Shore's views, and accordingly instructed Cornwallis to make settlement with the zamindārs, as far as practicable. The settlement was to be made at first for a period of ten years only, but with a definite idea of making it ultimately permanent.

In pursuance of the instructions received from England, Cornwallis appointed Shore President of the Board of Revenue, and some steps were taken with a view to making a long-term settlement. The necessary preliminaries were not completed till 1790, but during this interval Cornwallis' views underwent an important change. Instead of a provisional settlement for ten years to be ultimately made permanent, he decided upon launching immediately a plan of

[1] Ranajit Guha, *A Rule of Property for Bengal*, pp. 11–12.

permanent settlement. His views were opposed by most of his advisers, including both Shore and Grant. Grant naturally wanted to postpone an irrevocable measure of this type till a further and exhaustive study of the records was made to decide the question of the proprietary right of the land. Shore wanted to postpone it till a proper survey could enable the Government to make the perpetual assessment on a sound and equitable basis.

Cornwallis, on the other hand, maintained that enough material was already in the possession of the Government to decide the issue, both as regards the theoretical aspect of the question, as well as the more practical one, viz. fixing the total amount of the revenue to be demanded from zamindārs. He further held that at present revenue matters were taking so much of the time and energy of the Government that nothing but a permanent measure of this type would enable them to devote the proper share of attention to the more important duties of the Government like administration and justice. Among the beneficent effects of a permanent settlement of land Cornwallis laid particular stress upon the encouragement it would give the zamindārs not only to develop their lands but also to reclaim waste lands which extended at that time over a large portion of the whole province.

On the 10th February, 1790, Cornwallis announced the settlement of land-revenue for ten years, to be made permanent if approved by the Court of Directors. The approval of the Directors reached Cornwallis in 1793, and on 22nd March of that year the Decennial Settlement was declared permanent. Its effect was to make the zamindārs permanent owners of the land, subject to the payment of a fixed annual revenue to the Government.

A thorny problem was thus solved after various experiments had been tried for more than twenty-five years. As to the justice and equity of this solution and its ultimate effect upon the country, opinions have always differed, as they differ even to-day. There is no doubt that it ultimately, but not without many years of suffering, created a class of loyal land-holders who formed a stable element in the State, and a steady source of a fixed amount of revenue. But it deprived the Government of the benefit of a gradually expanding income from the land, which forms the most valuable source of revenue in Bengal. Further, while it fully conceded the claims of the zamindārs, it altogether ignored those of the cultivators, who were placed absolutely at the tender mercies of the zamindārs. Cornwallis certainly issued regulations to limit and control the authority of the zamindār over his

tenants, but these bore little fruit, and further legislation became necessary to remedy this grave defect of the Permanent Settlement.

A few words may be said regarding the other sources of revenue referred to above.

The revenues of salt and opium were at first managed by the system of auction, as in the case of land-revenue, the settlement being made with the highest bidder. In 1780 the manufacture of salt was directly taken up by the Government and a small establishment was set up to manage it under the control of the Supreme Council. The *Sair* revenue was managed by the same agency as the land-revenue.

B. The Administration of Justice

In India the administration of civil justice was closely associated with the management of revenue, and the grant of *Diwānī* rights in 1765 comprised both these functions. As in the case of revenue, repeated experiments were made before a definite system of administration of justice was evolved. These experiments were closely connected with, and may be said to form almost an essential part of, those in connection with the land-revenue. In any case, both passed through the same process of evolution, and the judicial system at each stage during this experimental period can only be understood with reference to the system of revenue administration.

The question was first definitely taken up in 1772. Two courts were established in each district, the Diwānī Adālat with a civil and the Faujdārī Adālat with a criminal jurisdiction. In addition to these, two superior courts were established in Calcutta, viz. Sadar Diwānī Adālat, as a court of appeal in civil cases, and Sadar Nizāmat Adālat for revising and confirming sentences. The Diwānī Adālat in each district was in charge of the Collector, and the Sadar Diwānī Adālat was presided over by the President and members of Council. The criminal courts remained in charge of Indian judges, according to old customs and precedents, but the Collectors and the Council exercised some control respectively over the district courts and the Sadar Nizāmat Adālat.

The changes in the system of revenue administration in 1773, 1781 and 1786 brought about corresponding changes in the administration of justice. In 1774 the district courts were placed in charge of Indian officers called Āmils. An appeal lay from their decision to the Provincial Councils and, in important cases, from them to the Sadar Diwānī Adālat.

In 1775 the Sadar Nizāmat Adālat was transferred to Murshidābād and placed in charge of the Nāib-Nāzim. A Faujdār was appointed in each district to bring criminals to justice.

In 1780 the judicial powers of the six Provincial Councils were transferred to six courts of Diwānī Adālat each presided over by a covenanted servant of the Company. In 1781 the number of these courts was increased to eighteen and all civil cases were tried by them. In other words, the old district courts under European supervision were revived. But except in four districts, where the Collector presided over these courts, they were placed under separate judges. Their decision was final up to 1,000 rupees, but where the amount in dispute was larger, an appeal lay to the Sadar Diwānī Adālat. At the same time the Faujdārī system of 1775 was abolished and the powers and duties of the Faujdārs were transferred to the judges of the district courts. The criminals were, however, tried in the Faujdārī or criminal courts under Indian judges, under the ultimate control of the Nāib-Nāzim at Murshidābād.

In the meanwhile a new element had been introduced by the establishment of the Supreme Court in Calcutta, in 1774, by virtue of the Regulating Act. This court, established by the Crown and consisting of a Chief Justice and three Puisne Judges, was vested with jurisdiction over British subjects only, but in practice it led to enormous difficulties. The court claimed, and actually did exercise, jurisdiction over all persons, and not only ignored the authority of the Company's courts but even entertained cases against the judges and officers of these courts for acts done in their official capacity. The legal principles and procedure which they followed were foreign to India and extremely vexatious. The Select Committee very truly observed that "the court has been generally terrible to the natives and has distracted the government of the Company". The pretensions of the Supreme Court reached their climax in the famous Cosijurā Case, which brought the matter to a head. A judge of the Supreme Court issued a writ against a zamindār, the Rājā of Cosijurā, but the Supreme Council denied the right of the Supreme Court to exercise jurisdiction over a zamindār, as he was neither a British subject nor a servant of a British subject. Accordingly when the officers of the Supreme Court proceeded to arrest the zamindār, the Council sent sepoys to arrest them. There was thus an almost open war between the highest executive and judicial authorities in Bengal. But a final catastrophe was averted by an ingenious device of Hastings'. He appointed Impey, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, as

President of the Sadar Diwānī Adālat, with a high salary, and the tension was immediately relieved.

This procedure, which is usually regarded as a bribe to Impey, was open to serious objections. One of the avowed objects for creating the Supreme Court was to have any complaints against the Company's servants dealt with by an independent tribunal. This object obviously could not be fulfilled so long as the head of the Supreme Court held office, with high emoluments, at the pleasure of the Governor-General and Council. The only relieving feature in this otherwise dark picture is that, apart from putting an end to the deadlock, it made the Sadar Diwānī Adālat, the highest appellate court in the province, a much more efficient institution than it could ever have been under the presidency of the Governor-General, who had little time, and perhaps less knowledge of law, to enable him to discharge the duties of the high office in a satisfactory manner.

But this arrangement was upset by the Home authorities. Impey had to refund the salary and was impeached. A new Statute passed in 1781 defined more clearly the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, exempting from it the official acts of the Governor-General and Council, the zamindārs or farmers, and all matters concerning revenue collection.

During the period of Cornwallis' administration, important changes were made in all branches of administration, including the judicial system. In 1787 the district courts were again placed under the Collectors except in Dacca, Patna and Murshidābād. The Collectors were vested with the powers of a magistrate and could try criminal cases within certain limits. The more important criminal cases were tried, as before, in district criminal courts and Sadar Nizāmat Adālat. The Collectors could not deal with revenue cases, which were transferred to the Board of Revenue.

Further changes were introduced in 1790. The experiment of making the Board of Revenue responsible for revenue cases proved a failure, and new local courts were instituted in each district under the Collector for trying these cases. Most far-reaching changes were made in the administration of criminal justice. The Sadar Nizāmat Adālat was again removed from Murshidābād to Calcutta (it had been done once before by Hastings) and in the place of a Muhammadan judge it was presided over by the Governor-General and Council, assisted by experts in Indian laws. The district criminal courts were abolished and their place was taken by four courts of circuit, established at Calcutta, Murshidābād, Patna and Dacca. These courts were presided over by two servants

of the Company, assisted by Indian experts, and they were to tour through the area of their jurisdictions twice every year. The powers of the Collectors, as magistrates, were further increased. They were made responsible for the custody of the prisoners and execution of the sentences passed on them by the four provincial criminal courts.

The famous Cornwallis Code of May, 1793, partly by defining the changes already made and partly by introducing new ones, ushered in the system which formed the steel frame of British-Indian administration. The changes proceeded on two principles. First, the necessity of reducing the multifarious duties of the Collector, which gave him almost unlimited authority and made him the sole representative of British authority in a district. Accordingly the Collector was divested of all judicial and magisterial powers, which devolved upon a new class of officers called Judges. The separate revenue courts for each district as well as the judicial powers of the Board of Revenue were abolished and the Judge tried all civil cases.

In addition to the twenty-three district courts and three city courts in Patna, Dacca and Murshidābād a large number of courts of lower grade were also set up to cope with the business. The lowest court was that of Munsiffs which could try cases up to 50 rupees. Next was that of the Registrars, a class of officials attached to the Zilā courts, who could try cases up to 200 rupees. From the decisions of all these courts an appeal lay to the district court.

The four provincial courts of circuit set up in 1790 were reorganised. Each of them now contained three, instead of two, English judges, and not only served as criminal courts of circuit as before, but also heard appeals from the decisions of the district judges. From them appeals lay in more important cases to the Sadar Diwānī Adālat in Calcutta. In order to curb the authority of the Collectors still further and to protect Indians from oppression at their hands, the Collectors and all the officers of the Government were "made amenable to the courts for acts done in their official capacities", and even Government itself in case of any dispute with its subjects over property had to "submit its rights to be tried in these courts under the existing laws and regulations".

The second principle on which Cornwallis proceeded was to divest the Indians of any real authority or responsibility in matters of administration. He had already deprived them of any real power in the administration of criminal justice, over which they

had formerly supreme and almost absolute control. He now deprived the zamindārs of the power and responsibility of maintaining peace within their jurisdiction. They were forced to disband their police forces, and their duties were entrusted to a number of Darogās in every district, each working within a defined area under the direct supervision of the Magistrate.

The net result of the changes introduced by Cornwallis was to divide the entire administrative work in a district between two European officers, one acting as a Collector of revenue, and the other as a Judge and Magistrate. Indians were deliberately excluded rom offices involving trust and responsibility.

Bengal, the Second Phase (1793–1828)

For a period of thirty-five years the system of Cornwallis was adopted as the guiding principle, and the Government were merely engaged in remedying the defects that gradually forced themselves on their attention. In connection with the Permanent Settlement, the main difficulties were about the regular collection of the stipulated dues. These fell heavily in arrears, with the consequence that lands were frequently sold and the ideas of a stable revenue and a loyal contented class of zamindārs were not realised to any considerable extent. Another defect of the Act was the insufficient protection it gave to the tenants against the oppression of the zamindārs. The establishment of the law-courts was expected to give the tenants the needed relief, but in practice it proved futile. In the absence of any regular survey of land and a definite record about the tenure of lands the law-courts could afford but little relief.

But even the protection of the courts soon proved illusory. For the law-suits multiplied so rapidly that the courts were unable to cope with them. The proverbial law's delay proved so serious in this instance that justice was practically denied, for, in the ordinary course, a case was not expected to be decided during the life-time of a man. Lastly, crimes increased enormously and there was no security of life and property.

It is needless to describe in detail the various measures taken by the successive Governors-General to cope with these serious evils. It will suffice to indicate the main lines of policy adopted by them.

As regards the Permanent Settlement, attempts were made to compile records of tenure and the Regulation VII of 1819 clearly defined the rights of the various classes of tenants. Greater power

was given to the zamindār to collect rents from his tenants and he was made liable to arrest on failure of the annual rent. To cope with the enormous increase in law-suits, the number of district judges was increased, the number and the powers of the lower courts were enhanced, and Indians were appointed as Munsiffs (with larger powers than those of 1793) and Sadar Amīns to try civil cases within a prescribed limit. As regards criminal cases, the magistrate's power to try them was enlarged and he was authorised to delegate it to his assistants. The Collectors were again empowered to try certain classes of revenue cases, and a few selected among them were vested with the powers of magistrates. Suitable changes were made in the procedure of the provincial appellate courts, so that appeal cases might be tried even when the judges were on circuit. The number of judges in these courts was increased from three to four. The Sadar Diwānī Adālat was entirely reconstituted. Instead of the Governor-General and Council, three judges were placed in charge of it, and their number was gradually increased to five. In 1797 an appeal from the decision of this body to the King in Council was permitted in cases where the amount in dispute was over £5,000.

In order to maintain law and order, an efficient police system was organised both in large towns as well as in the headquarters of every district. They worked under the supervision of four Police Superintendents, stationed in Calcutta, Dacca, Patna and Murshidābād.

Bengal, the Third Phase (1829–1858)

The first radical change in the system of Cornwallis was effected by Lord William Bentinck in 1829. The new scheme of administration centred round a class of officials called Commissioners, each of whom was placed in charge of a division comprising several districts. The Provincial courts of appeal and the posts of Superintendents of Police were abolished and their duties were transferred to the Commissioner. In addition to these, he had to supervise the work of the Collectors, magistrates and judges of the districts under him. Experience, however, soon proved that these tasks were too much for a single individual, and as a result of the reshufflings made in 1831 and 1837, the duties of the sessions judge were transferred to the district judge, and the latter was relieved of his magisterial functions by the creation of new posts for that purpose. Thus the district administration was carried on by the judge, the Collector, and the magistrate, with assistants belonging

to the covenanted Civil Service, under the supervision of the Divisional Commissioner.

Another important feature of the change was to entrust Indians with a larger share in administrative work. For this purpose Deputy-Magistrates and Deputy-Collectors were recruited from among them, and, for hearing civil cases, a new post of Principal Sadar Amin was created, from whose decisions, in certain cases, an appeal lay directly to the Sadar Diwānī Adālat of Calcutta and not to the District Judge as was hitherto the practice.

Lord William Bentinck also created the posts of Joint Magistrates and placed them in charge of sub-divisions. Gradually the Deputy Magistrates were also appointed as sub-divisional officers.

The most notable change in the administration of Bengal took place in 1854. Up to that year the Governor-General and Council were also responsible for the administration of Bengal, and naturally the local needs of Bengal yielded in importance to the greater imperial issues that almost always confronted that body. By the Charter Act of 1853 Bengal, Bihār, Orissa and Assam were placed in charge of a Lieutenant-Governor, and Mr. F. J. Halliday was appointed to this post on 28th April, 1854.

Madras

In Madras, as in Bengal, the chief administrative problem was the collection of land-revenue, which was the main source of the income of the State. Unlike Bengal, however, the British territories in Madras were acquired in different times from different powers, and had different laws and usages. The administration of land-revenue had, therefore, to be based on different principles in order to suit the local needs.

In general two different systems were adopted. In the *Jāgīr* area and Northern Sarkārs each village was owned by a number of Mirasdārs, who possessed heritable shares, and the principal persons among them had long been accustomed to act as the representatives of the village. Accordingly settlement of the whole village was made with a committee of the principal Mirasdārs in return for a lump sum.

An altogether different system prevailed in Baramahal, which was conquered from Tipu in 1792. Here the village headman collected dues from each cultivator, and paid them to the State. Alexander Read and Thomas Munro studied the details of this system and gradually evolved what is known as the *ryotwārī* settlement. The essence of the system, which was not fully

developed till 1855, is that the settlement is made with small farmers who enjoy all rights in the land subject to the payment of a fixed revenue which is collected by the State directly by its own servants. The settlement is made and renewed for specified periods, usually thirty years, during which the ryot is not liable to be ousted from the land or to pay any additional charge. In this settlement the Government share is limited to half the net value of the crop.

The two systems described above were usually adopted, and applied to territories added from time to time by conquest or cessions. But the *ryotwārī* system found greater favour, especially as the *Mirasdārī* gave scope for the principal people to exert oppression upon the rest of the villagers.

After the introduction of the Permanent Settlement in Bengal, the system was also introduced in Madras. The Poligārs in Madras, who corresponded to the zamindārs of Bengal, were more like feudal chiefs with military retainers, exercising extensive judicial and executive authority within their jurisdiction. The settlement was made with them in perpetuity, on the lines followed in Bengal, and they were deprived of their military and judicial powers. So far the experiment was on the whole a success. But there were many parts of Madras which had no Poligārs and here the Government tried to obviate the difficulty by creating a new class of zamindārs. A number of villages were grouped into a fairly large estate and it was then sold by auction to the highest bidder. The result was extremely unsatisfactory and the system was gradually dropped, at first in favour of the *Mirasdārī* and ultimately in favour of the *ryotwārī* system.

The *ryotwārī* system soon came to be the recognised form of settlement. But the *Zamindārī* system prevailed in about a fourth part of the province, and the *Mirasdārī*, though officially abandoned, prevails in a few isolated areas.

Along with the Permanent Settlement, the judicial system of Cornwallis was also introduced in Madras. The evolution of the administrative machinery followed here nearly the same course as in Bengal. The province was divided into a number of districts, and each district into Tāluks. At first the District Judge was also vested with magisterial and police authorities but these functions were soon transferred to the Collector. Gradually the office of the Collector became a very important one, and in addition to the duties of a Bengal Collector, he had important functions in connection with the assessment and collection of land-revenue.

Other Parts of British India

The system of administration evolved in Bengal was similarly extended to other parts of British India and need not be described in detail. As regards land-settlements, the *ryotwārī* system was adopted in Bombay, and in the Upper Provinces, roughly corresponding to the modern United Provinces, the settlement was made with the village community and resembled the *Miraṣdārī* system of Madras. The village community does not necessarily mean a collective ownership of all the villagers, but usually that of a group of persons more or less closely connected, who were responsible both jointly and severally for the payment of the revenue, fixed for periods of thirty years. The names of Mountstuart Elphinstone and James Thomason are associated with the evolution of the system in Bombay and the U.P. respectively.

The system of the U.P. was adopted in the Punjab with slight modifications, and in both these provinces steps were taken to safeguard the interests of cultivators who were not members of the village community. In practice, a cultivator who occupied a holding continuously for twelve years was deemed to possess permanent and heritable right in it, subject to the payment of a judicially fixed rent. This right was legally recognised by the Punjab Tenancy Act of 1868. The Oudh Tenancy Act, passed in the same year, did not proceed so far, but it granted occupancy rights to nearly one-fifth of the cultivators and introduced more equitable principles in respect of compensation for improvements and increases of rents.

The judicial system of Bengal was extended to Benares, Oudh and the Doāb respectively in 1795, 1803 and 1804. On account of the great distance from Calcutta separate courts of Sadar Diwānī Adālat and Sadar Nizāmat Adālat were set up in Allahābād in 1831.

As regards Bombay, the regulations of 1799 set up a system of judicial administration like that of Bengal, but it was revised in 1827 under Mountstuart Elphinstone. The new scheme set up Zilā courts presided over by one judge from whose decision an appeal lay to the Sadar Diwānī Adālat. Smaller cases were tried by lower courts in charge of Indians. Thus Elphinstone forestalled to some extent the reforms of Bentinck which were introduced all over British India, generally on the lines adopted in Bengal.

Supreme Courts

Reference has already been made to the establishment of a Supreme Court in Calcutta, and its early history. In 1797 the number of judges was reduced to three. A Supreme Court, with similar powers, constitution and jurisdiction, was set up in Madras in 1801 and in Bombay in 1823.

In 1853, the jurisdiction of these courts was limited to (*a*) British-born subjects, (*b*) persons residing within the boundaries of the three cities or having any dwelling-house and servants therein, and (*c*) all persons who were directly or indirectly in the service of the Company.

The law followed by these courts was the English law of 1726 as subsequently modified expressly with reference to India and the Regulations made by the Indian Government. But as regards inheritance, succession and contract, Hindu laws and usages were to be applied to the Hindus, and Muslim laws and usages to Muslims.

An appeal lay from the decisions of these courts to the King-in-Council where the amount in dispute was above Rs. 4,000 (Rs. 3,000 in Bombay). The Statute of 1833 transferred the entire appellate jurisdiction of the King-in-Council to the newly constituted Judicial Committee of the Privy Council which consisted of the President, the Lord Chancellor and other members, including two who held judgeships in the British dominions beyond the sea.

Finally we may refer to the two most notable landmarks in the judicial administration of India, viz. the codification of laws and the establishment of High Courts, the foundation of which was laid during the administration of the Company though the completion had to be deferred till India passed under the Crown.

The idea of a systematic code of law in place of varying laws and usages is traceable to an early period of British history. No less than five different bodies of statute law were in force in the British dominions, and the position was always regarded as extremely unsatisfactory. The Charter Act of 1833 provided for their consolidation and codification, and accordingly a Law Commission was appointed in the year 1834. Macaulay, the leading spirit of the Commission, prepared a draft of the Indian Penal Code, but little was done after his departure, and the Commission was finally abolished.

The Charter Act of 1853 led to the appointment of a new Commission. It submitted plans for the creation of High Courts by the amalgamation of the Supreme Court and Sadar Diwānī Adālat

and also for a uniform code of civil and criminal procedure applicable to these High Courts and inferior courts of British India.

The recommendations were accepted and in 1861 the Indian High Courts Act authorised the establishment of a High Court in each of the following towns, namely Calcutta, Bombay and Madras in place of the old Supreme Court and the Sadar Diwānī Adālat which thus disappeared after nearly ninety years. In pursuance of the same policy, a High Court was established in Allahābād and a Chief Court in the Punjab in 1866.

Macaulay's Penal Code was revised and passed into law in 1860 and a Code of Civil Procedure and a Code of Criminal Procedure were promulgated respectively in 1859 and 1861.

CHAPTER IX

TRADE AND INDUSTRY, 1757–1857

ONE of the most important facts in the history of India during the first century of British rule is the decay of her flourishing trade and industry. In order to understand properly the extent to which British rule was a contributory cause of this decay it is necessary to begin with Bengal, the part of India where British rule was first effectively established.

Reference has already been made to the activities of European trading companies in Bengal. The Portuguese had developed an extensive foreign commerce in Bengal in the early seventeenth century, but their trade in the eighteenth century was practically negligible. The Danes had never had any important trade in Bengal. The French commerce in Bengal was also very small until Dupleix was appointed Intendant of Chandernagore, but with his transfer to Pondicherry in 1741 the French trade rapidly declined. The Dutch and the British alone carried on a flourishing trade in Bengal during the first half of the eighteenth century. After the acquisition of political authority in Bengal by the British East India Company, the Dutch were ousted from the field and the English Company enjoyed the monopoly of foreign commerce in Bengal. As already noted above, the Charter Act of 1813 abolished the monopoly of the Company's Indian trade, and the Charter Act of 1833 finally put an end to the commercial activities of the Company.

The volume of inland and foreign trade of Bengal, other than that carried on by the European Companies, was also very large during the first half of the eighteenth century. The Hindu, Armenian and Muhammadan merchants carried on a brisk trade with other parts of India and with Turkey, Arabia, Persia and even Tibet. The balance of foreign trade was, however, always in favour of Bengal, and the surplus value of its exports had to be paid for in gold. As a matter of fact, during the period 1708–1756, bullion formed nearly three-fourths of the value of total imports to Bengal.

The most important articles of export from Bengal were cotton and silk piece-goods, raw silk, sugar, salt, jute, saltpetre and

opium. The fine cotton cloths, especially the Dacca muslin, were in great demand all over the world. Bengal cotton goods were exported in large quantities by the European Companies and went overland to Ispahan and by sea to the markets of Basra, Mocha and Jedda. The Dutch exported annually three-quarters of a million pounds of Cāssimbāzār raw silk either to Japan or to Holland in the middle of the seventeenth century, and a large quantity was exported to Central Asia. Even in 'Ālīvardī Khān's time, nearly seventy lacs of rupees' worth of raw silk was entered in the Customs Office books at Murshidābād exclusive of the European investments.

Bengal was the chief centre of the sugar industry and exported large quantities of the commodity even in the middle of the eighteenth century. Down to the year 1756, a considerable trade in Bengal sugar was carried on with Madras, the Malabar coast, Bombay, Surāt, Sind, Muscat, the Persian Gulf, Mocha and Jedda. The jute industry of Bengal also began to develop in the middle of the eighteenth century.

An eminent English authority has observed that even in the year 1756 there was a large volume of trade flowing to Bengal from "the coast of Coromandel and Malabar, the Gulf of Persia and the Red Sea, nay even Manilla, China and the coast of Africa". Thus down to the eve of British rule there was a rich and prosperous trade in Bengal due to its flourishing agricultural and manufacturing industries.

The battle of Plassey was, however, a great turning-point, not only in the political but also in the economic history of Bengal. Apart from the resulting misrule and confusion, which had an adverse effect upon trade and industry, several causes directly operated in impoverishing the country and ruining its rich and prosperous trade and industry.

1. To begin with, there was the large economic drain. Mīr Jāfar and Mīr Kāsim had to pay enormous sums of money to the Company and its servants for gaining the throne of Bengal. During 1757–1765 it amounted to more than five millions sterling. From 1765 when the Company received the *Diwānī*, the surplus revenue of Bengal was invested in purchasing the articles exported from India by the English East India Company. By 1780, when this drain of wealth finally ceased, its amount had exceeded ten millions. There were, besides, exports of bullion to China, and the huge private fortunes of the servants of the Company, a substantial part of which must have found its way, in some shape or other to England. It has been estimated that the total drain from Bengal to England during the period 1757 to 1780 amounted to about thirty-eight million pounds sterling. It is immaterial whether

this wealth was transferred in the form of bullion or in the shape of articles of export in exchange for which Bengal received nothing. The fact remains that Bengal became poorer in the course of twenty-three years by nearly sixty crores of rupees (which was equivalent to three hundred crores of 1900, the purchasing power of the rupee being then at least five times as high). This heavy drain must have greatly impoverished the province, and crippled its capital wealth to the serious detriment of its trade and industry.

2. Abuse of *Dastaks*. In 1656, the East India Company obtained from Prince Shujā, the governor of Bengal, exemption from payment of the usual customs duty of 2½ per cent in return for an annual payment of Rs. 3,000. Murshid Qulī Jāfar Khān having refused to make this concession, the English Company obtained a fresh Charter from the Emperor Farrukhsiyar in 1717, renewing the same privileges. The Nawāb, however, stipulated and the Company agreed, that the Company's passports or *dastaks* could not be used for internal trade, and that they should cover the cases of only such articles as were either imported, or intended to be exported, by sea.

But the concession was abused in two ways. In the first place the servants of the Company used the *dastaks* for their private trade, and secondly the *dastaks* were sold to Indian merchants to enable them to evade the customs duty. In spite of the vigilance of Murshid Qulī and 'Alīvardī, the abuses became very extensive, and were subsequently complained of by Sirāj-ud-daulah. With the accession of Mīr Jāfar, these abuses became widely prevalent, and the servants of the Company also claimed exemption from the payment of duties in respect of inland trade. Mīr Jāfar made piteous complaints to the English Governor in Calcutta, but with no success. The result was that the Company's servants monopolised the inland trade of Bengal and amassed huge fortunes, while the Nawāb lost a large amount of revenue and the Indian traders were ruined by this unfair competition. In addition to this, the servants of the Company made unjust and illegal profit by oppressing the poor people. About them Mīr Kāsim wrote to the Company's Governor in 1762: "They forcibly take away the goods . . . for a fourth part of their value; and by way of violence and oppressions, they oblige the ryots to give five rupees for goods which are worth but one rupee." Official documents of the Company confirm this state of things, and add that those who refused the unjust demands of the Company's servants were "flogged or confined".

Mīr Kāsim protested against these iniquities more vigorously than his predecessor, and when the Council refused to grant any redress, he abolished the inland duties altogether, so that all the

traders should be on an equal footing. As we have seen above, this led to his quarrel with the English and cost him his throne.

3. Virtual monopoly enjoyed by the Company. The oppressions of the Company's servants soon took a new turn. In order to ensure a regular and abundant supply of cotton goods, the Company entered into forward contracts with the weavers to supply stipulated quantities of cloth at fixed dates. This became a new source of oppression in the hands of their servants. Armed with the authority of the Company, they forced the poor weavers, on pains of flogging, to sign most iniquitous bonds. The latter were paid for their goods much less than their usual price, sometimes even less than the cost of materials, while they were forbidden to work for any other party on pain of corporal punishment. A similar policy was adopted towards the workers in raw silk.

The story is current in Bengal that, in order to avoid being forced to weave for the Company, many weavers used to cut off their own thumbs. This story is perhaps merely a popular invention, but there is not the slightest doubt about the great misery and oppression suffered by the poor weavers at this time at the hands of the Company's servants. Verelst, writing in 1767, refers to the unusual scarcity of weavers, a great number of whom deserted their profession. Thus the monopolistic control of the Company, and the misconduct of its servants, paved the way for the ruin of cotton and silk weaving, the two flourishing industries of Bengal. Cornwallis made an earnest effort to revive the trade by stopping the two evils, but almost irreparable mischief had already been done.

4. English competition. The ruin of the weavers in Bengal was completed by the unfair competition of manufacturers in England. As soon as cotton and silk goods exported by the East India Company became popular in England, the jealous British manufacturers wanted to kill the industry by legislation. By the two laws passed by Parliament in 1700 and 1720, cotton and silk goods imported from India "could not be worn or otherwise used in England". There was, however, a great demand for these things in other European countries, and hence all the goods imported by the Company to England used to be exported to various other countries of Europe. But on account of the hostilities between England and other European powers, first during the War of American Independence and again during the Napoleonic wars, this re-export of Indian goods suffered a severe setback, and in 1779 there was a sudden fall in the import of cotton goods from Bengal. Further, on a memorial of the British calico printers in 1780, the Co n

of Directors agreed to stop the importation of printed cotton goods from Bengal for a term of four years.

Artificial restriction of imports by legislation gave a fillip to the cotton industry of England. By a series of inventions, the English cotton manufacturers improved the quality of their goods, and the Court of Directors observed in their letter of 20th August, 1788, that the duty and freight on the Company's imports had already enabled the English manufacturers to undersell Indian cotton goods in the British market. Hence the Company followed the policy of importing raw materials, viz. cotton, in place of manufactured goods. Next, they exported Manchester cotton goods to Bengal. With the perfection of the power loom, Manchester began to produce immense quantities of cheap cotton goods, and soon they flooded the markets of India. The average value of cotton goods annually exported from England was about £1,200,000 between 1786 and 1790. By 1809 it had increased to £18,400,000. Its subsequent progress was still more phenomenal.

Thus, at the very moment when the efforts of Cornwallis and the end of European war might have revived Bengal's cotton industry, it was killed by the application of power-spinning and power-weaving to the manufacture of cotton goods in England. No attempt was made to protect the Bengal industry from inevitable ruin either by legislation or by the introduction of improved methods.

Thus within half a century of the battle of Plassey, the phenomenal prosperity of Bengal suffered a serious setback from which it has not recovered even to-day. The circumstances under which the flourishing industries of Bengal were ruined, and the inland trade passed into the hands of a privileged class, almost completely crushed out of Bengal even the very spirit of trade and industry. The lack of capital, caused by the enormous drain of wealth, and the unsettled condition of the country owing to the misrule of the early period of British supremacy, made the revival of trade and industry well-nigh impossible. At the same time, the Permanent Settlement gave an impetus to agriculture and investment of capital in land. Thus while the loss of industry drove the poor people more and more to agriculture, the available capital was sunk mostly in land. The trade of the country passed into the hands of Europeans, who gradually built up their own system of commerce and banking in which people of the soil had little share. In a word, we find here the genesis of the entire economic system which prevails to-day in Bengal.

What has been said of Bengal in respect of trade and industry, applies in a general way to the rest of India. The general impression

that India has never been an industrial country is misleading in the extreme. Indian arts and crafts have been an important contributory factor to her immense wealth from time immemorial. "Even at a much later period," so runs the Industrial Commission Report, "when the merchant adventurers from the West made their first appearance in India, the industrial development of this country was, at any rate, not inferior to that of the more advanced European nations." The finished products of Indian industry as well as her natural products such as pearl, perfumes, dye-stuff, spices, sugar, opium, etc., were exported to distant countries and she imported gold, copper, zinc, tin, lead, wine, horses, etc. But there was always an excess of exports over imports, which meant necessarily the influx of a large quantity of gold. In the first century Pliny bitterly complained of the drain of gold from the Roman Empire caused by the use of Indian luxuries. A similar complaint was made in the eighteenth century even by Englishmen.

The chief industry in India was the weaving of cotton, silk and wool. Outside Bengal, Lucknow, Ahmādābād, Nāgpur and Madurā were important centres of cotton industry, and fine shawls were manufactured in the Punjab and Kāshmīr. Brass, copper and bell-metal wares were manufactured all over India, some of the notable centres being Benares, Tanjore, Poona, Nāsik and Ahmadābād. Jewellery, stone-carving, filigree work in gold and silver, and artistic work in marble, sandalwood, ivory and glass formed other important industries. In addition, there were various other miscellaneous arts and crafts such as tannery, perfumery, paper-making, etc.

The carrying trade was also largely in the hands of the Indians. Down to the beginning of the nineteenth century A.D. the ship-building industry was more developed in India than in England. Like the Indian textile industry, it roused the jealousy of English manufacturers and its progress and development were restricted by legislation.

As in Bengal, the decay of trade and industry in the rest of India set in towards the close of the eighteenth century and its ruin was well-nigh complete by the middle of the nineteenth.

The prominent causes of the decay were the same as those operating in Bengal: the policy of the British Parliament, the competition of cheap goods produced by machinery, and the unwillingness or inability of the Indian Government to protect or encourage Indian arts and crafts. The extent to which the policy of the British Government in India was responsible for the decay of her trade and industry is a debatable point. Some writers think

that it was the Industrial Revolution in England, with the application of power-spinning and power-weaving to the production of cotton goods, which ruined Indian manufacture of cotton goods, and it was impossible for the ruling authorities to make any successful effort to protect the industry, as they were quite unable to offset the enormous disparity between power and hand manufacture. Rushbrook Williams, who holds the above view, further adds: 'Those who would blame the British authorities for not taking steps to protect Indian cotton manufactures against the new and overwhelming advantages enjoyed by the power-driven British industry, are obliged to assume that contemporary statesmen regarded these problems from a purely modern standpoint."

On the other hand, eminent writers, both Indian and English, have pointed out that the Industrial Revolution in England was itself "a consequence of the plundered wealth of India", and that not only did the British authorities not take any step to protect the declining Indian industries but they actually threw obstacles in their way, and at least in some cases, discouraged Indian manufactures in order to promote those of England.

As to the last remark of Rushbrook Williams, it is necessary to remember that even as early as 1700 (and ever since), British statesmen had enough idea of the modern economic system to protect English industry by legislation from Indian competition. That similar steps were not taken to protect Indian industry, cannot, therefore, be explained by lack of statesmanship, and may, not unreasonably, be attributed to the desire on the part of the ruling authorities to promote English industry at the cost of Indian. One can, of course, entertain reasonable doubts about the success of any attempt to stem the tide of English competition. But it is a hypothetical question and raises important issues which cannot be discussed here. The broad fact remains that, during the first half of the nineteenth century, India lost the proud position of supremacy in the trade and industry of the world, which she had been occupying for well-nigh two thousand years, and was gradually transformed into a plantation for the production of raw materials and a dumping-ground for the cheap manufactured goods from the West. All the while the Government responsible for the welfare of its teeming millions looked on and did not take adequate steps to avert the calamity.

CHAPTER X

THE DAWN OF NEW INDIA

1. The New India and Rājā Rāmmohan Roy

In spite of political convulsions and economic retrogression the first century of British rule in India (1757–1858) is in certain respects a memorable epoch in her history. The period witnessed a remarkable outburst of intellectual activity in India and a radical transformation in her social and religious ideas.

The impetus to these changes came from the introduction of English education. Through this channel came the liberal ideas of the West which stirred the people and roused them from the slumber of ages. A critical outlook on the past and new aspirations for the future marked the new awakening. Reason and judgment took the place of faith and belief; superstition yielded to science; immobility was replaced by progress, and a zeal for reform of proved abuses overpowered age-long apathy and inertia, and a complacent acquiescence in whatever was current in society. The traditional meaning of the *Śāstras* was subjected to critical examination and new conceptions of morality and religion remodelled the orthodox beliefs and habits.

This great change affected at first only a small group of persons, but gradually the ideas spread among larger sections of the people, and ultimately their influence reached, in greater or less degree, even the masses.

The new spirit of this age is strikingly illustrated by the life and career of Rājā Rāmmohan Roy, a remarkable personality, the centenary of whose death (1833) was celebrated some years back all over India.

The Rājā began his reforming activity by preaching the unity of God, and assailing the prevalent Hindu belief in many gods and the worship of their images with elaborate rituals. He tried to demonstrate that his views were in accordance with the old and true scriptures of the Hindus, and that the modern deviations from them are due to superstitions of a later age without any moral and religious sanction behind them. Rāmmohan's views stirred Hindu society to its depths, and bitter controversies followed.

Rāmmohan published Bengali translations of ancient scriptures in order to defend his thesis, and carried on the contest, almost single-handed, by the publication of a large number of Bengali tracts. Towards the close of his life he founded, in 1828, an organisation for furthering his religious views. This organisation ultimately developed into the Brāhma Samāj and will be dealt with in a later section. An indirect result of his campaign was the impetus given to the development of Bengali prose literature and Bengali journalism.

Rāmmohan was a great pioneer of English education. Not only did he himself found institutions for that purpose, but he always lent a helping hand to others who endeavoured to do so.[1]

Rāmmohan's reforming activity was also directed against the social abuses of Hindu society, notably the rigours of caste and the degrading position of women. The part he played in abolishing the self-immolation of widows will be described later on. He also endeavoured to ameliorate the condition of helpless widows in various ways, notably by changing the Hindu laws of inheritance about women and giving them proper education. He was opposed to polygamy and various other abuses in the social system of Bengal. He also advocated re-marriage of widows under specified circumstances. His ideals of womanhood and of man's duty towards them, preached in forceful language in various tracts, were far ahead of his age and were inspired by the memories of the golden age of India. On the whole he struck the true keynote of social reform in India by upholding the cause of women and denouncing the rigours of caste rules, the two main lines on which all social reforms have proceeded since.

In the field of Indian politics also, Rājā Rāmmohan was the prophet of the new age. He laid down the lines for political agitation in a constitutional manner which ultimately led to the birth of the Indian National Congress half a century later. His views on political problems are surprisingly modern, and in essential features represent the high-water mark of Indian political thought of the nineteenth century.

The basic principles of Rāmmohan's politics were "love of freedom, amounting to the strongest passion of his soul", and a sincere belief that the people of India have the same capability for improvement as any other civilised people. The political ideals of the Rājā are thus described by his English biographer:

"The prospect of an educated India, of an India approximating to European standards of culture, seems to have never been long absent from Rāmmohan's mind; and he did, however vaguely,

[1] See page 811.

claim in advance for his countrymen the political rights which progress in civilisation inevitably involves. Here, again, Rāmmohan stands forth as the tribune and prophet of New India."

Reference may be made to some concrete views of the Rājā to illustrate the currents of political thought of the day.

The Rājā was a great champion of the liberty of the Press. Ever since 1799 there had been a strict censorship on the publication of journals. In 1817 Lord Hastings abolished the censorship, but laid down regulations, which, among other things, prohibited the discussion of certain matters. Mr. Adam, who acted as Governor-General after the resignation of Lord Hastings, issued ordinances prohibiting the publication of newspapers or other periodicals without a Government licence. Rājā Rāmmohan presented petitions against the new Press Regulations both to the Supreme Court and to the King-in-Council. The petitions were rejected but they form a "noble landmark in the progress of Indian culture". We may again quote from his English biography: "The appeal is one of the noblest pieces of English to which Rāmmohan put his hand. Its stately periods and not less stately thought recall the eloquence of the great orators of a century ago. In language and style for ever associated with the glorious vindication of liberty, it invokes against the arbitrary exercise of British power the principles and traditions which are distinctive of British history." Rāmmohan's labours bore fruit, though he was not destined to witness it. In 1835 Sir Charles Metcalfe removed all restrictions on the Press.

The Rājā similarly drew up petitions against the Jury Act of 1827. The provisions of the Act and the grounds of the Rājā's objection thereto may be gathered from the following extract:

"In his famous Jury Bill, Mr. Wynn, the late President of the Board of Control, has, by introducing religious distinctions into the judicial system of this country, not only afforded just grounds for dissatisfaction among the natives in general, but has excited much alarm in the breast of every one conversant with political principles. Any natives, either Hindu or Muhammadan, are rendered by this Bill subject to judicial trial by Christians either European or native, while Christians, including native converts, are exempted from the degradation of being tried either by a Hindu or Mussulman juror, however high he may stand in the estimation of society. This Bill also denies both to Hindus and Muhammadans the honour of a seat on the Grand Jury even in the trial of fellow-Hindus or Mussulmans. This is the sum total of Mr. Wynn's late Jury Bill, of which we bitterly complain."

The Rājā had a clear grasp of the political machinery by which India was ruled and fully realised the importance of presenting India's case before the Home authorities when the question of the renewal of the Company's Charter in 1833 was being considered by Parliament. This was one of his main objects in undertaking the voyage to England. He was invited to give evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, and although he declined to appear in person, he submitted his considered views in the form of several "communications to the Board of Control". These documents enable us to gather the view-point of Rājā Rāmmohan and of the advanced Indian thinkers of his time, on the burning questions of the day.

The Rājā strongly championed the cause of the peasants. He pointed out that under the Permanent Settlement, the zamindārs had increased their wealth, but the exorbitantly high rents exacted from their tenants had made the lot of the ryots a miserable one. He advocated a reduction of the rent to be paid by the tenants by means of a corresponding reduction in the revenue payable by the zamindārs. The consequent loss of revenue, he suggested, should be met by a tax upon luxuries or by employing low-salaried Indians as collectors, instead of high-salaried Europeans. The Rājā favoured the Permanent Settlement but he rightly urged that the Government should fix the maximum rent to be paid by each cultivator.

Among the other measures advocated by the Rājā may be mentioned the Indianisation of the British-Indian army, trial by jury, separation of the offices of judge and magistrate, codification of civil and criminal laws, consultation with the Indian leaders before enactment of new laws, and the substitution of English for Persian as the official language of the courts of law.

A careful perusal of the above fully justifies the claim that "Rāmmohan Roy laid the foundation of all the principal movements for the elevation of the Indians" which characterise the nineteenth century. His English biographer truly remarks that the Rājā "presents a most instructive and inspiring study for the new India of which he is the type and pioneer. . . . He embodies the new spirit . . . its freedom of enquiry, its thirst for science, its large human sympathy, its pure and sifted ethics, along with its reverent but not uncritical regard for the past and prudent . . . disinclination towards revolt".

2. Introduction of English Education

While the British took over the administration of Bengal, all higher education was confined to a study of classical Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian in *tols* and *madrāsās*. Vernaculars were sadly neglected, and neither natural science nor subjects like Mathematics, History, Political Philosophy, Economics or Geography formed part of the curriculum. Grammar, Classic Literature, Logic, Philosophy, Law and Religious Texts formed the main elements of higher study, while elementary education, imparted in *pāthsālās* and *maktabs*, consisted of the three R's and religious myths and legends. As to the world outside India, and the great strides Europe had made since the Renaissance, Indians had little knowledge and less interest. In matters of education and intellectual progress India was passing through a period analogous to the Middle Ages of Europe.

The British Government at first took but little interest in the development of education. Warren Hastings encouraged the revival of Indian learning and to him we owe the foundation of the Calcutta Madrāsā (1781). Inspired by the same spirit, Sir William Jones founded the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Calcutta, in 1784, and a Sanskrit College was established at Benares by the Resident Jonathan Duncan in 1792. But there was no proposal or even a remote suggestion of establishing a system of education under Government supervision or control.

The idea of setting up a network of schools for teaching English was first mooted by Charles Grant, a Civil Servant of the Company. He rightly held that the social abuses and the moral degradation of the people were "the results of dense and widespread ignorance, and could be removed only by education, first of all by education in English". Grant, on his return to England, tried to persuade the House of Commons and the Court of Directors to his view, but without success.

What Grant failed to do through Government, the Christian missionaries undertook to accomplish in Madras and Bengal. Among these noble bands of workers to whom India owes the beginning of English education, one name stands foremost, that of William Carey. Originally a shoe-maker by profession, he became a Baptist Missionary in later life, and came to Calcutta in 1793. Missionary schools had already been established in Madras with Government support, but Carey and his friends, although denied any such help, in the beginning, set up schools and published Bengali translations of the Bible. Thus they laid the foundations of English education

and Bengali prose literature. It is along lines laid down by them that intellectual development has taken place in subsequent times.

Carey's example was followed by other missionaries and liberal Indians, the most notable among them being David Hare and Rājā Rāmmohan Roy. These two were mainly instrumental in establishing several English schools, including the Hindu College (1817) which afterwards developed into the Presidency College.

Government could not altogether ignore the new spirit. At the time of the renewal of the Company's Charter in 1813, Parliament asked the Company to take measures for the "introduction of useful knowledge and religious and moral improvements", and further directed that "a sum of not less than a lac of rupees should be set apart each year, and applied to the revival and improvement of literature and the encouragement of the learned natives of India, and for the introduction and promotion of a knowledge of the sciences among the inhabitants of the British territories in India". Unfortunately no immediate or important results followed. It was not until 1823 that a Committee of Public Instruction was appointed in Bengal, and then steps were taken to establish a Sanskrit College in Calcutta. Against this a spirited protest was made by Rājā Rāmmohan Roy in the form of a petition to the Governor-General, Lord Amherst. This historic document admirably sums up the views held by advanced and progressive minds of the time. Referring to the proposed Sanskrit College the Rājā remarks, "The pupils will here acquire what was known two thousand years ago, with the addition of vain and empty subtleties. . . ." "The Sanskrit system of education," continues the document, "would be the best calculated to keep this country in darkness if such had been the policy of the British legislature. But as the improvement of the native population is the object of the Government, it will consequently promote a more liberal and enlightened system of instruction, embracing mathematics, natural philosophy, chemistry and anatomy, with other useful sciences which may be accomplished with the sum proposed, by employing a few gentlemen of talents and learning educated in Europe, and providing a College furnished with the necessary books, instruments and other apparatus."

The petition brings into prominent relief the divergent views of the Government on the one hand and advanced thinkers, both Indian and European, on the other. While the Committee of Public Instruction spent its resources in printing Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian works and maintaining the Sanskrit College and the Madrāsā, the missionaries, helped by liberal Indians, set up

schools and colleges for education on Western lines and established a School-Book Society for selling English books. The prevailing spirit of the time is clearly indicated by the fact, noted by Trevelyan, that "upwards of 31,000 English books were sold by the School-Book Society in the course of two years, while the Committee did not dispose of Arabic and Sanskrit volumes enough in three years to pay the expense of keeping them for two months, to say nothing of the printing expenses".

The new ideas soon made their influence felt even in the Committee of Public Instruction. It was gradually divided into two parties known popularly as the "Orientalists" and the "Anglicists" or the English party. The latter held that public funds should henceforth be devoted only to the imparting of liberal education on Western lines through the medium of English. Although this could naturally reach only a limited number of pupils, it was argued that ultimately this knowledge would spread through them to the masses by means of vernacular literature. This is the famous "filtration theory" advocated by the "Anglicists".

The appointment of the famous missionary, Alexander Duff, on the Committee of Public Instruction strengthened the hands of the English party and it scored its first triumph when Lord William Bentinck established the Medical College in Calcutta in February, 1835. The appointment, in 1834, of Thomas Babington Macaulay, the new Law Member, as President of the Committee completed the discomfiture of the Orientalist party. By his vehement denunciation of classical Indian learning and eloquent pleadings in favour of Western education in his Minute of 2nd February, 1835, he carried Bentinck with him and on 7th March, 1835, the Council decided that henceforth the available public funds should be spent on English education. The existing oriental institutions like the Sanskrit College and the Madrāsā were to continue, but fresh awards of stipends to students of these institutions and the publication of classical texts must cease. The funds thus released were to be spent "in imparting to the native population a knowledge of English literature and science through the medium of the English language."

The cause of English education was still further advanced by the regulation introduced by the first Lord Hardinge that all public services were to be filled by an open competitive examination held by the Council of Education (the successor of the Committee of Public Instruction), preference being given to the knowledge of English. Virtually English education was made the only passport to higher appointments available to the Indians, and hence its popularity and rapid progress were equally assured.

The chief defect of the system, as it was worked out in Bengal, was the disproportionate attention paid to the English education of the middle-class gentry as against the education of the masses through vernacular schools. William Adam, who was appointed by Bentinck's Government to investigate the condition of indigenous education, wrote valuable reports (in 1835, 1836 and 1838) on the subject. He described the miserable condition of the vernacular schools and the widespread ignorance and superstition prevailing among the masses. But Government relied on the "filtration theory", and little was done to improve the system of primary education for the masses.

This evil, however, was not so acute outside Bengal. In Bombay, Madras and the North-Western Provinces, English education developed on similar lines, thanks either to the enterprise of the missionaries or the initiative taken by the Government. But there was less keenness for English education and naturally more attention was paid to the improvement of indigenous schools and the spread of education through the vernaculars.

The advantages of English education were reaped mostly by the middle-class Hindus. The Hindu aristocracy and the Muslim community generally held aloof from it. But although confined to a few, English education produced memorable results. It not only qualified Indians for taking their share in the administration of their country, but it also inspired them with those liberal ideas which were sweeping over England and led to such momentous measures as the Catholic Emancipation Act (1829), the Reform Bill (1832), the Abolition of Slavery (1833), and the New Poor Law (1834). Unfortunately some grave defects characterised the new system of education from the very beginning. In the first place it was too literary, and, secondly, it was entirely divorced from religious and moral instruction. The first may be ascribed to a great extent to the personality of Macaulay, and the second was entirely due to the peculiar circumstance that the Government had to steer clear of the Christian zeal of the missionaries on the one hand, and the deep-rooted religious ideas of the Hindus and Muslims on the other. Their decision not to interfere in religious matters in any way was, in the circumstances, a wise one.

Although the beginnings of English education on a sound basis are to be traced to the momentous decision of 1835, the evolution of a comprehensive and co-ordinated system of education had to wait for nearly twenty years till the next revision of the Charter. A Parliamentary Committee was appointed on that occasion to examine the whole subject. The result was the memorable Despatch of Sir

Charles Wood, President of the Board of Control, dated 19th July, 1854, which laid the foundations on which the educational system in British India subsequently developed.

The most characteristic feature of the new scheme was the creation of a properly co-ordinated system of education from the lowest to the highest stage. There was to be an adequate number of efficient teaching institutions such as primary schools, higher schools, and colleges, each leading to the next higher step. A regular system of scholarships was instituted to enable meritorious students to prosecute the higher course of study, and educational institutions founded by private efforts were to be helped by grants from Government funds.

In order to carry out the above objects, a special Department of Education was to be created in each province and an adequate system of inspection would be provided for by the appointment of a sufficient number of inspectors.

For co-ordinating higher education a University should be established in each Presidency town. It would be mainly an Examining Body on the model of the London University. But while the higher teaching would be chiefly imparted through colleges, the University might institute Professorships in Law, Civil Engineering, Vernaculars and Classical languages.

Stress was laid upon the importance of mass education, female education, improvement of the vernaculars and the training of teachers. Every district was to have schools "whose object should be not to train highly a few youths, but to provide more opportunities than now exist for the acquisition of such an improved education as will make those that possess it more useful members of society in every condition of life".

Finally it was definitely laid down that the vernaculars should be the medium of instruction. "It is neither our aim nor desire", so runs the Despatch, "to substitute the English language for the Vernacular dialects of the country. . . . It is indispensable, therefore, that in any general system of education the study of them should be assiduously attended to, and any acquaintance with improved European knowledge which is to be communicated to the great mass of the people can only be conveyed to them through one or other of these Vernacular languages."

As regards religious instruction in the Government institutions, the Despatch clearly lays down that as these "were founded for the benefit of the whole population of India . . . the education conveyed in them should be exclusively secular".

Lord Dalhousie lost no time in giving effect to the policy out-

lined in the Despatch. Within a few years Departments of Public Instruction were established in all the provinces. The first University in India, that of Calcutta, was founded in 1857, and between 1857 and 1887 four new Universities, at Bombay, Madras, Lahore and Allahābād, were added. But before any substantial progress could be made, the great Revolt broke out and the government of the East India Company came to an end.

3. The Government and Social Reform

From the very beginning the British Government in India assumed a policy of benevolent neutrality in religious and social matters. In spite of strong pressure they refused to encourage, far less actively help, the religious propaganda of the Christian missionaries in India. The same policy induced them to dissociate religious instruction from the educational institutions maintained by the Government.

On the other hand the British Government not only tolerated all the rites and customs of the Indians, but sometimes even went so far as to evoke the criticism that they honoured and encouraged them by their favour. Two specific instances may be quoted. Under the Hindu law, a convert to Christianity forfeited his inheritance and was subject to other disabilities, and this was sanctioned by the British Government. Again, extreme deference was shown by the Government to many Hindu festivals and religious ceremonies, and on some of these occasions there was even a display of troops and firing of salutes.

This benevolent attitude was, however, shortly given up. A law passed in 1832, supplemented by another in 1850, removed all disabilities due to change of religion, and instructions were issued by the President of the Board of Control in 1833 that Government should cease to show any special favour or respect to Indian religious ceremonies. These instructions, including others requiring the abolition of the pilgrim tax and official control of temple endowments, were enforced by Lord Auckland.

But even the policy of benevolent neutrality was bound to come into conflict with the humane and progressive ideas that animated liberal Englishmen. In spite of their repeatedly declared policy of not interfering with the social and religious practices of the Indians, English rulers were impelled by considerations of humanity to co-operate with advanced Indian reformers in removing some gross evils which prevailed in Hindu society under the sanction of religion or long-standing usage.

The first to be attacked was the curious practice of **infanticide**. It was a long-standing custom among certain Hindus to throw a child into the sea at the mouth of the Ganges, in fulfilment of religious vows. A childless woman, for example, praying for progeny, would take a vow that if she had more than one child, one would be offered to Mother Ganges. Although not very widely prevalent, this inhumanity was too glaring to be ignored by anyone whose feelings were not totally blunted by religious superstition.

Another form of infanticide was far more widely spread, especially among the Rājputs, Jāts and Mewāts in Central and Western India. Here, the difficulty of marrying girls led the parents to kill them, while infants, by refusing proper nourishment, or sometimes even poisoning the nipples of the mothers' breasts. Enlightened and philanthropic British officers tried to stop this practice by persuasion, but this proved unsuccessful.

Ultimately laws had to be passed prohibiting both these forms of infanticide. Bengal Regulation XXI of 1795 and Regulation VI of 1802 dealt respectively with the second and first forms of infanticide, declaring both as murder.

But even the legislation of 1795, extended to newly added provinces by another Regulation in 1804, failed to remove at once the gross abuse of secret murder of girls, as by the very nature of the case it could often avoid detection. The practice, however, slowly died out, as a result of the influence of Western education and Western ideas.

The reforms of these abuses were followed by the suppression of another horrid custom. This was the so-called "Suttee" (*Satī*). The word means a chaste and virtuous woman but has by a curious process been applied to the practice of burning chaste women along with the dead bodies of their husbands.

Among primitive peoples of many lands there was a belief that life after death is more or less a continuation of the present life and subject to the same material needs. Accordingly a man needs his wife and attendants in the other world, and so the death of a king or a leading chief was followed by the immolation, either voluntary or forcible, of his wives, concubines, attendants and servants, so that they might keep company with their deceased lord and serve him in the same way as on earth. This custom prevailed in India, China, Babylonia and many other countries, and its traces linger in Japan where the death of the ruler is sometimes followed by the *Hara-kiri* or suicide of devoted subjects.

The burning of the wife is in one aspect the last remnant of this widely spread primitive custom. It must have been prevalent in

India from a very early period, and Greek writers have preserved detailed accounts of a case that occurred in the fourth century B.C. But still it was not enjoined as a sacred religious duty until centuries later. The practice is not referred to in the earliest law-books, and is merely permitted as an option to widows in later books. It is only towards the close of the Ancient period, or perhaps even later, that the practice was definitely enjoined as a religious duty. The last stage in this tragic drama was reached when the scriptures laid down self-immolation on the funeral pyre of her husband as the only meritorious course that a virtuous woman could follow. Not only would such a woman enjoy eternal bliss in heaven along with her husband, but her action would expiate the sins of three generations of her husband's family, both on his father's and mother's side.

Such hopes and encouragements both to the victim and her natural protectors produced the inevitable consequences, and every year hundreds of women met with a cruel death in the name of religion. In many cases the material interests of the male relations, added to religious faith, induced them to persuade, sometimes even to force, the unhappy victim to the tragic course. Sometimes opium and other drugs were used to benumb the senses of the woman, so that she might be easily persuaded to adopt the fatal resolve. Cases are on record when the woman fleeing from the first touch of fire was again forcibly placed upon the funeral pyre. To prevent such incidents the male relations often took care to cover the body of the widow with wood, leaves and straw and then pressed it down by means of two bamboos before setting fire to the pyre. At the same time the thunderous noise of the crowd mingled with sounds of drums ensured that the cries of agony from the wretched girl would not be heard by any spectator.

The very fact that such practices could endure for centuries among an intelligent and cultured people, illustrates in a striking manner how faith in a supermundane existence, instead of enlightening and purifying the ideas and sentiments of man, at times warps his judgment and paralyses his noble instincts and human feelings.

It is gratifying to note that enlightened Mughul rulers like Akbar not only raised their voice in protest but also took effective steps to prevent the obnoxious practice. But the absence of an organised and sustained effort led to no permanent result. From the early days of British rule both officials and missionaries appealed to the Government to stop this baleful custom, and an agitation was set on foot in England to force the hands of the authorities at home. But hampered by their declared policy of *laissez-faire* in matters

of religion, and afraid to offend the religious susceptibilities of a large class of subjects which might ultimately affect the military, the British Government in India long hesitated to take any decisive step. The Supreme Court, however, refused to tolerate it within the precincts of Calcutta, and the Dutch, the Danes and the French prohibited it respectively in Chinsurā, Serāmpur and Chandernagore.

The Government at first instructed its officers to take no further step than dissuading the intended victims by gentle persuasion. In 1789 the Collector of Shāhābād referred the matter to Lord Cornwallis in the following words: "The rites and superstitions of the Hindu religion should be allowed with the most unqualified tolerance, but a practice at which human nature shudders I cannot permit without particular instructions." In reply he was told that his action must be "confined to dissuasion and must not extend to coercive measures or to any exertion of official powers".

The letter of the Collector and the reply thereto typify the early official attitude on the question. When a similar letter was written by the Magistrate of the Bihār district in 1805, Lord Wellesley referred it to the Court of Nizāmat Adālat. On the basis of the replies received, the Government framed regulations on the subject in 1812 and supplemented them by others in 1815 and 1817. The net result of these regulations was to prevent the burning of widows who were either of tender age, or were pregnant or had infant children. They also made it criminal to compel a woman to burn herself or to drug or intoxicate her for that purpose.

These regulations bore but little fruit and reliable evidence shows that in the districts round Calcutta alone the number of "Satis" averaged more than five hundred each year. British officials were never tired of urging upon the attention of the Government the necessity of abolishing the practice altogether. The Government, however, was unable to take its courage in both hands and preferred to rely upon the gradual enlightenment of Indian opinion for the ultimate abolition of the practice.

The signs of this progressive spirit were not lacking. Thanks to the unwearied efforts of Rājā Rāmmohan Roy enlightened Indian opinion gradually asserted itself. When the orthodox Hindus protested against the regulations of 1817 and sent a petition to the Government for their repeal, a counter-petition was submitted by the Rājā and his coadjutors. After describing the horrors of the "Suttee" in vivid terms, they declared that "all these instances are murders, according to every Shāstra as well as to the common sense of all nations". To educate public opinion Rājā Rāmmohan

vrote a pamphlet on the subject and organised a vigilance committee in order to ensure that the Government regulations were followed in each instance. The Rājā was bitterly opposed by orthodox Hindus under the leadership of Rājā Rādhā Kānta Deb. Feelings at last ran so high that even Rājā Rāmmohan's life was threatened.

When things had reached this acute stage, Lord William Bentinck was appointed Governor-General and was instructed by the Home authorities to consider definite measures for the immediate or gradual abolition of *Satī*. After carefully studying the situation he decided to abolish it immediately. His zeal for reform was not shared by many. Even Rājā Rāmmohan advised caution, believing that immediate abolition might cause great discontent and excitement. Bentinck's ardent desires for reform, however, brooked no delay. On 4th December, 1829, was passed the famous Regulation XVII which declared *Satī* illegal and punishable by courts. Not only the persons who used inducement or compulsion of any kind, but even those who were associated in any way with the voluntary act of a *Satī* were to be regarded as criminals.

As expected, Bentinck's measures evoked loud protest. A largely-signed petition of remonstrance was presented to the Governor-General, and an appeal was made to the authorities in England. To counteract these measures Rājā Rāmmohan sent a congratulatory petition to the Governor-General, signed by 300 residents of Calcutta. One of the reasons which induced him to visit England was to thwart any attempt to have the new Regulation repealed by the Privy Council. Rāmmohan's attempts were crowned with success. The new Regulation was upheld by the Home authorities and thus the inhuman practice was at last definitely brought to an end. Bentinck's efforts were nobly supplemented by the first Lord Hardinge, who was mainly instrumental in suppressing *Satī* and infanticide in the Indian States.

Another great reform standing to the credit of Lord William Bentinck is the suppression of the organised bands of *Thugs*. These secret assemblages of criminals had peculiar modes of initiating their members, who, travelling in disguise, murdered helpless travellers, mostly by strangulation with a handkerchief or scarf used as a noose. Although the members were recruited from both Hindus and Muslims, the Thugs were reputed to be devotees of the goddess Kālī, and carried on their heinous trade of murder under the mistaken belief that it had the sanction of the goddess. The organisation spread almost all over India and there are reasons to believe that they secured active help from certain chiefs, landholders and merchants. Sir William Sleeman and a number of al-

officers were specially selected to crush the organisation, and Bentinck passed a series of special Acts to regulate their proceedings. More than three thousand Thugs were caught during 1831–1837, and as a result of these vigorous measures India was soon rid of this great scourge.

A momentous reform, which created, however, very little sensation, was the abolition of slavery by Act V of 1843. Contrary to the general popular belief, slavery was a very ancient institution in this country, and even in 1843 "there were many millions of slaves in India". Still the Act which "refused to recognise slavery as a legal status" and thereby automatically set the slaves free without any compensation to the owners provoked neither opposition nor excitement. This is an evidence of the high moral tone infused by Western education and liberal English tradition. The abolition of State lotteries in the Presidency towns about the same time furnishes one more instance of the liberal spirit that actuated the Government of the day. An attempt was made to justify them on the ground that the proceeds were spent on local improvements, but the serious objection to the practice on moral grounds prevailed against any idea of pecuniary gain.

To the first Lord Hardinge's Government belongs the credit of taking steps to stop the human sacrifices practised by the Khonds in Orissa under the erroneous belief that thereby the fertility of the land was increased. Although the results achieved during Hardinge's Governor-Generalship were not very satisfactory, the cruel and atrocious practices were definitely stamped out by the energetic efforts of Campbell and other officers specially appointed for the purpose during 1847 to 1854.

PART III

Book II

MODERN INDIA

CHAPTER I

POLITICAL RELATIONS, 1858–1905

1. Afghānistān and the North-West Frontier

THE period from 1858, when the Government of India began to be conducted in the name of the Sovereign of England, to 1937, when "provincial autonomy" was inaugurated under the reformed constitution of 1935, marks a distinct epoch in Indian history. The age is capable of a twofold division, viz., the Era of Imperialism (1858–1905) and the Epoch of Reforms (1905–1937). A noticeable feature of the age was the control exercised by one of the British Sovereign's principal Secretaries of State over Indian administration. Nowhere was this more apparent than in foreign policy. Indeed it would be hardly any exaggeration to say that from 1858 onwards the foreign policy of India was dictated in large measure by European conditions and formed a part of the foreign policy of the British Government in Whitehall in London.

Regarding the North-West Frontier, the policy was for a long period based on the relations between England and Russia. After the first Afghān War there was a revival of friendly feeling between the two countries. In 1844 the Russian Emperor Nicholas I visited Queen Victoria and an understanding was arrived at in respect of Central Asia. The basis of the agreement was that the *khanates* (principalities) of Bukhārā, Khiva, and Samarqānd should be left "as a neutral zone between the two empires in order to preserve them from a dangerous contact".

These friendly relations were, however, rudely disturbed by the Crimean War, and Russia, foiled in south-eastern Europe, resumed her forward policy in Central Asia. The rapid progress of Russia towards the border of Afghānistān was a cause of alarm and anxiety to the British Government. The conquest of the Punjab and Sind had extended the British possessions up to the hills of Afghānistān, and that country alone now stood between the advanced Russian outposts and the British empire in India. But unhappily affairs in Afghānistān about that time proved unfavourable to the British.

After the conclusion of the First Afghān War, the relations between the British Government and Dost Muhammad, the Amīr of Kābul, were, on the whole, friendly. When the Persians threatened Herāt and Qandahār, the Amīr made overtures for help to the British, and a treaty was concluded in

1855. By this treaty the Indian Government undertook not to violate the territory of the Amīr, and the latter agreed to be "the friend of the friends and enemy of the enemies of the Honourable East India Company".

The friendship was put to the test in 1856 when the Persians again besieged Herāt. The British not only helped the Amīr with money and arms, but also declared war against Persia, and sent a force from Bombay. The Persians came to terms in 1857.

The friendly feeling was first disturbed in 1862 when Dost Muhammad became aggressive and attacked Herāt, then held by an independent Chief. The Government of India disapproved of this action and recalled its Muslim agent who had been installed in Kābul since 1857. Dost Muhammad paid no heed to the protest and succeeded in conquering Herāt in 1863.

Shortly after this Dost Muhammad died at the age of eighty, and the inevitable struggle for succession broke out among his sixteen sons. For five years Afghānistān became a scene of fratricidal wars, with all the attendant evils of discord, disunion and partition of territories. At last in 1868 Sher ʿĀlī, the third son of the late Amīr and his chosen successor, defeated all his rivals and united the whole of Afghānistān under his rule.

The position of the British during this period was one of extreme difficulty. Sir John Lawrence (Governor-General, 1864–69) adopted a policy of strict neutrality, and logically followed the principle that the relations of the British Government are with the actual rulers of Afghānistān. Accordingly he refused help to the several contending brothers who asked for it, and recognised each of them in turn as soon as he established himself in Kābul. Sher ʿĀlī had thrice approached the British Government for help and was thrice refused. As soon, however, as he proved successful in the contest, Lawrence recognised him and sent him money which enabled him finally to consolidate his position.

The policy followed by Lawrence has been characterised by some as one of "masterly inactivity", but it has been severely condemned by others. His policy of neutrality was dictated by the fear that if he took up the cause of one rival, the other was sure to seek the aid of Russia or Persia. Against this it is pointed out that this contingency was almost inevitable whether the British Government interfered or not. It is, however, overlooked that the neutrality of the British would legitimately entitle them to prevent any interference from outside if and when it did occur, whereas if Lawrence actively backed up one candidate he could hardly, with justice or reason, prevent Russia or Persia from supporting another. In any case it must be admitted that he succeeded in isolating the Afghān Civil War and prevented any international complication.

The critics of Lawrence no doubt imply that if he had actively supported a rival candidate and enabled him to win the throne, the British could have easily secured a firm footing in Afghānistān, and effectively stopped for ever the Russian influence in that quarter. The experience of the First

Afghān War was, however, entirely against any such anticipation, and Lawrence might, after all, have backed the wrong horse and atoned heavily for it. With this serious danger in view, and the almost inevitable complication of a Russian war, Lawrence might well be excused if he chose to follow a more cautious policy. It was one of those enterprises where success would make it an act of far-sighted statesmanship, and failure brand it as a rash and foolish adventure.

That the result of Lawrence's policy proved to be disadvantageous to the British nobody can deny. Sher 'Ālī, the new Amīr, could not be expected to have a friendly attitude towards a power which refused to come to his help in the most critical moments of his life. Sher 'Ālī could easily realise, what was no doubt the plain truth, "that the English had looked to nothing but their own interests". He bitterly commented that "Whosesoever side they see strongest for the time being, they turn to him as their friend".

It was precisely during this period of Afghān turmoil that the Russians resumed their aggressive imperialism in Central Asia. In 1864 they made the first forward move. In 1866 Bukhārā was reduced to the position of a dependency. In the very next year was created the new province of Russian Turkestān with headquarters at Tashkhend, about a thousand miles from their former base at Orenburg. In 1868 Samarqānd was added to Russian possessions and five years later Khiva followed suit.

The rapid progress of Russia towards Afghānistān could not but be a cause of alarm and anxiety to the British. Their first endeavour was therefore to placate the new Amīr whom the recent events had so much alienated from the British. Lawrence sent arms and money in 1868 and the subsidy was continued by Lord Mayo (1869–72). How far these methods would have succeeded in regaining the friendship of the Amīr, it is difficult to say. But the Russian advance constituted a serious menace to Afghānistān, and hence the Amīr was anxious to secure the support of the English. A rapprochement between the two parties was thus rendered easy, and had the English acted with tact and statesmanship they might have completely won over the Amīr to their side. Unfortunately, English diplomacy failed miserably at this critical moment, and instead of winning the friendship of the Amīr, drove him into the arms of Russia.

A meeting which was held at Ambala in 1869 between the Amīr and Lord Mayo offered splendid opportunities for a lasting friendship. The Amīr would have conceded all English demands in return for an English guarantee that they would support him against Russia, and would acknowledge no one as Amīr of Afghānistān except himself and his descendants. Instead of giving these specific assurances, Lord Mayo merely said in a letter to the Amīr that the Government of India would "view with severe displeasure any attempts on the part of your rivals to disturb your position" and that it would "further endeavour . . . to strengthen the Government of Your Highness".

The admirers of Mayo have represented the meeting at Ambala as a great

success and pretended to believe that Sher 'Ālī was won over to the side of the British. But Sher 'Āli was too shrewd not to perceive the difference between a specific guarantee and a general assurance of the kind contained in Lord Mayo's letter. In any case, being alarmed by the Russian occupation of Khiva he sent an Agent to Lord Northbrook, the next Governor-General, in 1873, asking for specific assurance in writing that if Russia or any of its protected or dependent States invaded the Amīr's territories, the British Government would not only help the Amīr with arms and money, but also send troops to his aid if necessary.

Lord Northbrook (1872–76) took a wise view of the situation and was willing to accede to the Amīr's request. Five years earlier, an Indian Viceroy would have probably given such a guarantee on his own responsibility, referring his action for ratification to the Secretary of State. But the establishment of the direct telegraph line between India and London introduced a great change in the relations between the Governor-General and the Secretary of State. So in a telegram to the Secretary of State, dated 24th July, 1873, he proposed to assure the Amīr "that if he unreservedly accepts and acts on our advice in all external relations, we will help him with money, arms and troops if necessary to expel unprovoked invasion. We to be the judge of the necessity".

The proposal was, however, rejected by the Secretary of State, as the ministry of Gladstone was unwilling to have a rupture with Russia, and did not view the Russian expansion in Central Asia as dangerous to the safety and security of either Afghānistān or India. Under the instructions of the Home Government, Lord Northbrook could only assure the Amīr that "we shall maintain our settled policy in Afghānistān". The Amīr naturally interpreted it as unwillingness on the part of the English to afford him protection against Russia.

Two other events occurred about this time which further alienated the Amīr. The British Government unwisely accepted the task of arbitrating between the claims of Persia and Afghānistān over the boundaries in Seistān. As the decision of the British went in some details against Afghānistān the Amīr resented it as an act of injustice. In the second place, when the Amīr chose his son 'Abdullah Jān as heir apparent and communicated his decision to the Government of India, Lord Northbrook refused to recognise him as such, and the Amīr was convinced that 'Abdullah Jān would receive no more support from the British than he himself had obtained in fighting his rivals for the throne.

Utterly disgusted at the attitude of the English, the Amīr naturally longed for a good understanding with the Russians, and they eagerly seized the opportunity. Although they admitted that Afghānistān was beyond their sphere of interest, they carried on correspondence with the Amīr and tried to ingratiate themselves into his favour. The Russian correspondence gradually increased and its bearers, treated by the Amīr as agents of the Russian Government, were almost always present in Kābul.

In the meantime there was a change in the Home Government. In 1874 Disraeli succeeded Gladstone, and Lord Salisbury became the Secretary of State for India. Two years later Northbrook was succeeded by Lord Lytton (1876–80) as Viceroy. The Russo-Turkish war of 1877 strained the relations between Russia and England, and a war between the two appeared almost inevitable. The pendulum now swung violently in the opposite direction. The new Cabinet at once decided to keep a firm hold on Afghân affairs to prevent the influence of Russia in that region.

The first measure they adopted was the annexation of Quetta. It occupied a strategic position on the frontier, as it controlled the route to Qandahār, and could turn the flank of an army invading India through the Khyber Pass. A treaty was concluded with the Khān of Kalat, and Quetta was occupied in 1877.

The second objective of the new Cabinet was the establishment of a British agent at Herāt, so that the Government might be constantly supplied with accurate information regarding the Russian movements on the frontier. Lord Northbrook, who continued as Viceroy till 1876, and the majority of his Council, were opposed to the policy. They thought the Amīr was sure to refuse it and the result would be another war. Lord Salisbury insisted on his view. Lord Northbrook thereupon resigned his viceroyalty, and Lord Lytton was appointed Viceroy to carry out the new policy. The Amīr was offered the terms he asked for in 1873, but nevertheless he refused to accept any British Mission. He pointed out that in that case he could hardly refuse to accept a similar mission from the Russians.

In the meantime the Amīr's relations with Russia grew more intimate. In June, 1878, the Russian Governor-General sent his officer, Stolietoff, to the Amīr with a draft treaty which conceded the terms which the Amīr had asked of the British in 1873, and Lord Lytton was ready to offer in 1878. The despatch of the envoy was accompanied by that of three columns of troops from Tashkhend towards the Afghān frontier. Stolietoff was ordered by the Amīr not to enter Afghānistān, but he ignored the orders and reached Kābul on 22nd July. There he negotiated a treaty with the Amīr, offering him guarantee against foreign attack.

The reception of the Russian envoy in Kābul made the relations between the Amīr and the British Government acute. With the previous approval of the Home Government, Lytton informed the Amir that an English envoy would be sent to Kābul. The mission was actually despatched through the Khyber Pass, but it was stopped near 'Ālī Masjid on 21st September. On 2nd November Lytton sent an ultimatum to the Amīr, threatening war if the latter did not reply, accepting the mission, by the 20th. The Amīr now appealed to Russia for help. But in the meantime the Treaty of Berlin had settled the European question, and the Russians could not fight the English without violating that treaty and losing all the advantages they had secured

by it. So Kaufmann, the Russian Governor-General, advised Sher ʿĀli to make peace with the British. Sher ʿĀli had been encouraged by the Russians to provoke the hostility of the British, but was deserted by them at the critical moment.

On 20th November the British troops invaded Afghānistān. The Kurram Pass was forced by Roberts, and Qandahār was occupied by General Stewart. In December, Sher ʿĀlī retired to Turkestān and died shorty after. His son, Yaʿkūb, opened negotiations with the British and on 26th May, 1879, the Treaty of Gandamak was concluded.

The treaty was extremely favourable to the British and conceded all their demands. The Amīr agreed to the establishment of a permanent British envoy at Kābul and to conduct his foreign policy on the advice of the Viceroy. He also ceded the districts of Kurram, Pishin, and Sibi to the British. Referring to the Treaty of Gandamak, Lytton observed that by it the British Government secured two objects, that is, the elimination of other foreign influence from Afghānistān and rectification of the Afghān frontier in such a way as to safeguard permanently British influence in that State. Lord Beaconsfield claimed that the treaty had "secured a scientific and adequate frontier for our Indian Empire".

In accordance with the terms of the treaty, Cavagnari, the British Agent, reached Kābul on 24th July. But he was murdered by mutinous troops on 3rd September. To what extent, if any, the Amīr himself was implicated in this plot has never been determined. There is no doubt that Cavagnari displayed lamentable lack of tact in his handling of affairs, and there is equally little doubt that the Amīr desired his withdrawal.

The foul murder led to the revival of hostilities. Roberts occupied Kābul on 7th October. Although the Amīr had joined the British, he was thought unfit to rule and was removed to India. Negotiations were opened with Sher ʿĀlī's nephew, ʿAbdur Rahmān, who was a refugee in Samarqānd under Russian protection.

But before the negotiations were brought to a close, the Government of Lord Beaconsfield was succeeded by that of Gladstone. The new Government decided to reverse the whole Afghān policy of their predecessors and even to evacuate the districts ceded by the Treaty of Gandamak. Lord Ripon (1880–84) was accordingly sent as Viceroy to carry out the new policy.

Shortly after the arrival of Lord Ripon (8th June, 1880) the British troops in Qandahār were severely defeated by Ayūb Khan, son of Sher ʿĀlī, at Maiwand (July, 1880). Roberts made his famous march from Kabul to Qandahār and completely defeated Ayūb's army. In this he was substantially helped by ʿAbdur Rahmān.

Lord Ripon, after studying the situation in India, decided to continue his predecessor's policy and entered into a treaty with ʿ Abdur Rahmān. The new Amīr agreed, in return for an annual subsidy, to have his foreign policy

controlled by the Government of India. The districts ceded by the Treaty of Gandamak were retained by the British.

The Second Afghān War was the outcome of the desire of two rival powers, Russia and England, to establish their influence in Afghānistān. The English statesmen were afraid of a Russian invasion of India through Afghānistān. Whether this menace was a real one may be seriously doubted. There is, however, no doubt that Russia, with a friendly Afghānistān, could bring sufficient pressure on the British, and could not only keep them engaged in the critical time of a European war, but might even use their position as a lever for extorting concessions from the British in Europe. Afghānistān was thus a mere pawn in the European game, and poor Sher ʿĀli was a victim of circumstances for which he was not responsible, and over which he had no control. Strange as it may seem, the Treaty of Berlin was the direct cause of the downfall of Sher ʿĀlī.

The Afghān policy of both England and Russia was dictated purely by motives of self-interest, based on an aggressive imperial policy. The forward policy of Lytton and Salisbury can be justified from this point of view alone, as it achieved the main object of British diplomacy, by securing a firm footing in Afghānistān for the British, and removing the Russian menace of including that country within their sphere of influence.

The Russian forward policy received a severe setback by the establishment of the British influence in Afghānistān. But, as if to make up for the lost ground, the Russians now pushed forward their outposts. The fears of the British Government were always allayed by the Russian Foreign Office by profuse professions of pacific intentions, and the aggressive acts were explained as unauthorised acts of local officials or as due to local necessities. At last, when in 1884 Merv was added to Russian possessions, the British entered most emphatic protests. The only result was the acceptance by the Russians of a proposal to delimit the Russo-Afghān boundaries. The Commissioners were appointed on both sides, but those of Russia delayed matters on one pretext or another. In the meantime, the Russian forces were occupying the disputed territories in order to convert their claims into accomplished facts.

The climax was reached on 30th March, 1885, when the Russians drove off the Afghāns from Panjdeh and occupied it. Even the pacific Government of Gladstone was roused to the frenzy of war. Mobilisation was ordered and a vote of credit for military preparations was moved in Parliament. The war which appeared almost inevitable was averted by the dexterity of Gladstone. The two nations at last came to terms. The Russians retained Panjdeh, but the Zulfikār Pass was given to the Amīr.

After this amicable settlement, the relations between Russia and the British Government improved. In 1886 the Commission for delimitation of boundaries concluded its labours and the Russo-Afghān boundary from the Oxus to the Zulfikār Pass was formally laid down. For six years

uninterrupted peace followed. But in 1892 disputes again broke out over the Russian claim over the whole of the Pāmirs. At last an agreement was reached in 1895, and the boundary-line in this region was formally fixed up. This brought to an end for the time being the long-standing rivalry between England and Russia over Asiatic empires. The English kept a firm hold on Afghānistān, and Russia directed her energy further towards the east.

Henceforth for several years the North-West Frontier policy of India was confined to relations with Afghānistān. The main problem was the position of the wild hill-tribes, which lived in the regions lying between Afghān and British territories and owed allegiance to neither. In pursuance of what has been termed the " Forward Policy ", the British Government desired to extend its power over them, so that the frontier of British India might be pushed far beyond the Indus. After some difficulties the two Governments came to an understanding regarding their spheres of influence. The Afghān Boundary Commission under Sir Mortimer Durand formally laid down the boundary-line. The Amīr's subsidy was raised from twelve to eighteen lakhs a year, and he agreed not to interfere with the tribes on the Indian side of the frontier line.

The next problem was to deal effectively with these tribes. This proved no easy task, and punitive expeditions were necessary to quell the turbulent clansmen. A formal protectorate was declared over Chitral and Gilgit in 1893, but two years later the British Officer sent to Chitral to help one of the rival candidates for the throne, was besieged by a large number of tribes who had declared *Jihad* or holy war against the British. The siege lasted for a month and a half, until a relieving army proceeded from Gilgit and another by way of the Malakand Pass. Again in 1897 there was a serious outbreak of hostilities. A large number of tribes, including the Mohmands and the Afridis, rose in revolt, and regular military expeditions, notably the Tirah campaign, were necessary to put them down.

To prevent the recurrence of these outbreaks strategic roads and railways were built in the frontier districts and are distribution of troops was made to cope with them more effectively and expeditiously. The frontier districts were separated from the Punjab and created into a North-West Frontier Province ruled over by a Chief Commissioner, immediately under the Governor-General, and subsequently by a Governor.

These measures did not prove successful in keeping the region quiet and free from disturbances. Occasional raids into British territory and other disturbances by the hill tribes came to be a permanent feature, and even the British Government had to resort to bombing from aeroplanes to strike terror into them. In the light of these subsequent events we can appreciate the wisdom of Amīr 'Abdur Rahmān when he described the probable results of the British forward policy in the following terms, in a letter written to Lord Lansdowne (1888–1894):

" If you should cut them (the hill tribes) out of my dominions they will neither be of any use to you nor to me. You will always be engaged in fighting or other trouble with them and they will always go on plundering. As long as your Government is strong and in peace, you will be able to keep them quiet by a strong hand, but if at any time a foreign enemy appear on the borders of India these frontier tribes will be your worst enemies."

The advocates of the forward policy on the other hand supported the intrusion of the British into these hill territories, as it gave them a better line of defence than the River Indus against any invasion from the west. This is perhaps correct from a strictly military point of view. But the enormous trouble and expense involved can be justified only if there was a real danger of a serious invasion from the west. Such danger was undoubtedly very remote when the policy was first adopted. But in the light of later events which no one could then have foreseen the threat could not be described as altogether an imaginary one.

2. Annexation of Upper Burma

As a result of two wars the British had occupied Arākān, Tenāsserim and Pegu in Lower Burma. The old Burmese dynasty was ruling in Upper Burma, and a British Resident was stationed in Māndālay, where the capital was removed in 1857. Trade was opened with Upper Burma, and English rights were safeguarded by two treaties in 1862 and 1867.

The relations between the two Governments were, however, never cordial. The loss of Lower Burma was a source of irritation to the Burmese king, Mindon, while his medieval idea of royal prestige was irritating to the British. According to the Burmese custom, the British Resident, when attending court, had to remove his shoes and kneel before the king. In 1876 the Viceroy objected to this, but Mindon would not yield. The result was that the British Residents ceased to visit the king and in consequence British influence at the Burmese court declined to some extent.

Mindon's successor, Thibaw, was a weak and vicious king. He signalised his succession by the massacre of eighty princes and princesses whom he feared as possible rivals. The British Resident protected, but was curtly reminded by the court that Burma was a sovereign power. The Chief Commissioner of Pegu recommended the withdrawal of the Resident, but the Government of India refused. Thibaw repeated the massacre in 1884. There was an outcry in the name of humanity, and public meetings held in Rangoon urged upon the Indian Government immediate annexation of Upper Burma. It is to be noted, however, that the Burmese population did not attend these meetings, which were really arranged by the English and

Chinese merchants, whose main interest was trade. The Government of India took no notice of these events, and were content to let Burmese affairs alone.

A new element was, however, added about this time in North-Eastern politics. France had established a colonial empire in the Far East. In 1884 she possessed Cochin-China and Tonkin, and was pushing towards Upper Burma. The Burmese Government was anxious for the friendship of France. In 1885 a trade treaty was signed between the two powers and the French secretly promised to allow importation of arms into Burma through Tonkin. A French Consul was stationed at Māndālay, and there were semi-official negotiations for opening a French bank at the city, starting a railway, and securing the management of royal monopolies.

The peaceful penetration of the French alarmed the British Government, but they could do nothing as they had no *casus belli* or ostensible ground for interference. This was, however, supplied by an action of Thibaw's. An English firm—the Bombay-Burma Trading Corporation—took lease of some forests from the Government of Burma on condition of paying a fixed amount per log. But the Company was charged with having defrauded the Government of a heavy amount. A regular trial was held and the Company was condemned to pay a fine of more than 23 lakhs of rupees. The Company influenced the Government of India, which demanded that the case should be referred to the arbitration of the Viceroy. This the Burmese king refused. Unfortunately for him, the French at this moment suffered serious reverses in Tonkin and withdrew from Upper Burma. The French ambassador in London repudiated the semi-official negotiations of the French Consul at Māndālay. The British seized this golden opportunity and struck hard. An ultimatum was sent to King Thibaw asking him to submit to the following terms:

1. A permanent Resident should be stationed at Māndālay, and he should have free access to the king without degrading ceremonies like taking off shoes and kneeling down.
2. The foreign policy of Burma should be controlled by the British.
3. The case of the Bombay-Burma Trading Corporation should be settled in consultation with a special envoy to be sent by the Viceroy.
4. The Burmese Government should assist British trade with Yunnan.

Thibaw's rejection of the ultimatum on 9th November, 1885, led to the British invasion. Within twenty days Māndālay was occupied and Thibaw found himself a prisoner in his own palace. But the fall of the capital did not mean the fall of the kingdom. A sort of guerilla warfare was maintained by bands of robbers and disbanded soldiers. It took five years to pacify and consolidate the kingdom of Upper Burma, and another six years to bring under effective control the areas ruled over by border tribes such

as the Shâns and the Chins. The conquered territories, added to Lower Burma, formed the new Province of Burma with headquarters at Rangoon.

The case of Burma affords an interesting parallel to that of Afghānistān on the opposite frontier. In both British policy was dictated by the fear that another first-class European power, Russia or France, would establish political influence in an Asiatic State bordering on British territories. The rulers of these States defied the English in the hope of obtaining aid from the rival European power, and in both cases they were disappointed at the critical moment. Only the geographical and ethnical factors made the sequel different. Burma was added to British India, but the high and rugged mountain ranges of Afghānistān and the fierce warlike Pathāns made the thorough conquest of that country a more formidable task.

3. The Indian States

The relations of the British Government with the Indian States underwent a great change after the assumption of the Government by the Crown. Before that the relations were neither uniform nor well defined. The first defect was indeed inevitable, because different States had concluded different types of treaty at different times and in different circumstances. As regards the second, the policy of a growing power like the British was naturally modified from time to time in consequence of various circumstances and influences. Much also depended upon the personal factor. Wellesley, Lord Hastings, and Dalhousie, as we have already seen, adopted a far more aggressive attitude than others, although no new policy was formulated by the Company during their regime.

The result was a state of uncertainty and perplexity in the Indian States. They did not know exactly where they stood. Theoretically their existence as a separate political entity was guaranteed by treaties, and many of them enjoyed an independent status, subject only to certain specified restrictions. In practice, however, many States were annexed by the British (such as Oudh, Sātārā, Nāgpur, Jhānsī, and the Carnatic) and in many others (such as Bharatpur, Mysore, and Gwālior) the British had not only interfered with the internal administration, but either deposed or definitely lowered the status of the Chiefs.

In 1841 the Court of Directors definitely adopted the policy " of abandoning no just and honourable accession of territory or revenue ", and Dalhousie carried this policy to its extreme limit. The outbreak of revolt in 1857 served as a lurid comment on this policy, and when the Government was transferred to the Crown, an entire re-orientation of policy towards the Native States took place. Like many other changes in British India, this new relation was only slowly and gradually evolved, partly by written declaration of policy, but mainly by precedents and conventions.

The new policy was heralded by a definite pledge in the Queen's proclamation that "We desire no extension of our present territorial possessions". This declaration would not perhaps have solved the problem, were it not accompanied by other steps to ensure its faithful observance. The two main grounds for recent annexations were (1) failure of natural heirs, and (2) misgovernment of native rulers. Means had to be devised to deal with them before the policy of non-annexation could be carried into practice.

The first offered a simple solution, and it was readily adopted. In 1860 *sanads* were granted to princes by which, on failure of natural heirs, the Hindu chiefs were authorised to adopt sons, and the Muslim chiefs to regulate their succession in any manner sanctioned by the Muslim law. These "Sanads of adoption", as they were called, guaranteed the perpetuity of States.

As regards misgovernment, matters were more complex, and obviously could not be dealt with by any fixed rule. To judge from the actual events that took place after 1858, it appears that the new policy was to punish the ruler for misgovernment, and, if necessary, to depose him, but not to annex the State for his misdeeds. A corollary to this new policy was to interfere in the internal administration before misgovernment could reach such proportions as would justify more drastic measures. A few concrete instances will explain the trend of the new policy.

The most important case is that of Malhār Rāo Gāikwār. He was guilty of gross misgovernment, and Colonel Phayre, the Resident, exposed the abuses of his administration. Thereupon the Gāikwār is alleged to have made an attempt to poison the Resident by mixing diamond dust with his food (November, 1874). Lord Northbrook had the Gāikwār arrested in January, 1875, and appointed a Commission for his trial. The Commission included three Indians and three Englishmen, and was presided over by the Chief Justice of Bengal. The Commission were divided in their opinion. The three Englishmen held the Gāikwār guilty of the charge, but the three eminent Indian members—the Mahārājās of Gwālior and Jaipur, and Sir Dinkar Rāo—were of opinion that the charge was not proved. The Government of India accordingly acquitted the Gāikwār of the charge of attempted murder, but deposed him for "his notorious misconduct, his gross misgovernment of the State, and his evident incapacity to carry into effect necessary reforms".

A new Gāikwār was installed on the throne. The choice fell upon a boy named Sayajī Rāo who was distantly connected with the ruling family. Arrangements were made for the proper education and training of the boy, and Sir T. Mādhava Rāo ably administered the State during his minority. The boy who was thus called to the throne became one of the most enlightened rulers of India, and under his paternal guidance Barodā became one of the most progressive States in the whole of India. He died in January, 1939.

The case of Manipur affords another illustration of the new policy. The new *Mahārāja*, Sura-Chandra, was deposed as a result of a palace revolution on 21st September, 1890. The *Senāpati*, Tikendrajit, an able and popular man, was suspected of instigating it, though there was no positive evidence in this respect. Sura-Chandra sought British help for his restoration. The Political Agent, Mr. Grimwood, was against it. After an interview between Lord Lansdowne, the Viceroy, and Mr. Quinton, the Chief Commissioner of Assam, towards the end of February, 1891, the Government of India decided to recognise Kula-Chandra, the second brother, as the *Mahārāja* of Manipur on his agreeing to the following conditions: (1) to govern the kingdom according to the advice of the Political Agent: (2) to allow the Political Agent to maintain 300 soldiers in the Residency; and (3) to deport Tikendrajit from Manipur. To give effect to these Mr. Quinton started for Manipur in March, 1891, with an escort of 400 Gurkha soldiers and a few civilians. When Mr. Quinton wanted to arrest Tikendrajit in his house on 24th March, the latter offered a strong resistance with Manipuri soldiers and the British force had to fall back to the Residency. The Manipuri soldiers even attacked the Residency and when the British position was almost hopeless there was a cease-fire. An interview was arranged with Tikendrajit in which Mr. Quinton, Mr. Grimwood, Lieutenant Simpson and two other Englishmen were present. But the negotiations failed and when the British party proceeded towards the gate they were attacked by an excited mob and without the knowledge of Tikendrajit four Englishmen were murdered by Tongol General. The rest returned to British territory on 31st March.

On hearing of this "foul murder" on 8th April, the British Government immediately sent military expeditions to avenge it. By 23rd May, Kula-Chandra, Tongol General and Tikendrajit were captured. Tikendrajit and Tongol General were tried by a Special Court, which according to some had no jurisdiction over Manipur subjects. They were sentenced to death and publicly hanged on 21st August. Death sentences on Kula-Chandra and his brother, Angao Sena, were commuted to transportation for life with confiscation of property. Modern researches indicate that Tikendrajit was not really guilty of the charges of murder, abatement of murder, or waging war against the Empress of India, but that he suffered the extreme penalty for "his capability and manliness which the British could not tolerate in the *de jure* or *de facto* ruler of any Native State".[1] In September, 1891, a boy of five was set up as the new ruler of Manipur and as he was a minor the State was administered by the Political Agent.

The cases of Barodā and Manipur afford a striking contrast to those of Oudh, the Punjab, Coorg, and many other States which were annexed, for similar reasons, during the rule of the East India Company. They show the readiness of the Paramount Government not only to intervene, but, if

[1] *Bengal: Past and Present*, Vol. LXXVIII (January to June, 1959), p. 21.

necessary, to take adequate steps for remedying the state of things, in cases of disputed succession, misgovernment, internal rebellion, etc. On the other hand they have equally demonstrated their unwillingness to annex the Indian States.

A desire to maintain the separate existence of the States is also clearly manifest from the example of Mysore. As already noted, the State was placed under British administration in 1831. After fifty years of British rule the State was restored to its lawful ruler (1881). This " rendition of Mysore " is fully in keeping with, and is a striking demonstration of, the new policy towards the Indian States.

These illustrations definitely prove that annexation of Indian States became a thing of the past, and neither failure of natural heirs nor misgovernment on the part of any ruler constituted any danger to the existence of a State. So far the Indian States have undoubtedly benefited by the change of government from the Company to the Crown. But corresponding with this increase in security and stability, there was a steady decrease in their status. This was partly inevitable and partly the result of a deliberate policy.

The States in 1858 numbered nearly six hundred. More than five hundred of these were petty principalities whose relations with the British Government were never clearly defined in writing. As to the rest, such relations were defined by treaties. But the treaty-rights were substantially different in the cases of different States, and accordingly they stood in varying degrees of subjection to the Imperial authority. Certain States like Hyderābād had at first entered into treaties with the Company on equal terms, and subsequently parted with some definite rights (e.g. control of foreign policy) and entered into some definite obligations (supply of a specified force). It was obvious that, barring these matters, it was, in theory, absolutely independent of any British control.

In the case of the Rājput States the treaties provided that the rulers should not maintain any relations with any foreign power, and should help the Company, in times of war, with all the resources of their States, but that they could exercise absolute power within their own territories.

These States obviously stood on a very different footing from others like Mysore, Barodā, or Oudh, where the treaties definitely authorised the British to interfere in internal matters. But even in these cases, the relations were defined by treaties, as between two independent powers, rather than by agreements imposed by a paramount power upon its subordinate State.

The policy of the Government under the Crown was to ignore these differences in the status of Indian States, and to uphold in theory and practice the paramountcy of the British Crown over all alike. This will be clearly manifest to anyone who studies the attitude of the British Government towards the Indian States since 1858.

The most direct enunciation of this new policy is to be found in the Act of 1876 by which Queen Victoria assumed the title of " Empress of India " with effect from 1st January, 1877. This at once brought the Indian States within the British Empire, and, legally speaking, the rulers and the people of the States were henceforth to be classed as vassals of the British Sovereign. In theory, at least, the change was really very great. The status of these States in the days of the East India Company has been discussed above. This was fully recognised by the Crown in the famous proclamation of 1858 as the following passage will show:

> " We hereby announce to the native princes of India, that all treaties and engagements made with them by or under the authority of the East India Company are by us accepted, and will be scrupulously maintained, and we look for the like observance on their part.
>
> " We desire no extension of our present territorial possessions; and while we will permit no aggression upon our dominions or our rights to be attempted with impunity, we shall sanction no encroachment on those of others.
>
> " We shall respect the rights, dignity and honour of native princes as our own; and we desire that they, as well as our own subjects, should enjoy that prosperity and social advancement which can only be secured by internal peace and good government."

It is obvious from the above that even after the assumption of the Indian Government by the Crown, the Indian States were recognised as independent sovereign States, and regarded as allies of the British Government rather than their subjects. But the Act of 1876 entirely changed this aspect, and made the Sovereign of England the suzerain of Indian States as well. Henceforth the British stood forth frankly as the Paramount Power, a position which in practice they had been assuming for some time past.

The new status is very clearly indicated in the Instrument of Transfer setting forth the conditions under which Mysore was restored to its Indian rulers in 1881. A comparison of this document with the Treaty of Seringapatam by which Wellesley defined the position of the newly created Hindu kingdom of Mysore is both interesting and instructive.

In the Treaty of Seringapatam it was laid down that " the friends and enemies of either of the contracting parties should be considered as the friends and enemies of both". In the Instrument of Transfer the ruler of Mysore was required to " remain faithful in allegiance and subordination to Her Majesty".

This frank assumption of the paramount authority was supplemented by a series of provisions in the Instrument of Transfer which were entirely wanting in the Treaty of Seringapatam. By these the Government of Mysore was to co-operate with the British in matters of administration such as

" the telegraphs and railways, the manufacture of salt and opium, the extradition of criminals, and the use of the currency of British India".

There was one new provision in the Instrument which demands special consideration. It is a definite declaration that no succession in the Government of Mysore was to be valid so long as it was not recognised by the Governor-General-in-Council. While the Crown had made a great concession to the demands of the Indian States by legalising adoption, it was more than counter-balanced by this new theory of succession. The Company had claimed to control succession in the States only in case of the death of a ruler without leaving any heir. The theory enunciated in the Instrument, however, is that no succession in an Indian State is valid until it is sanctioned by the British Government. That this was henceforth the accepted policy of the Government is proved by declarations of both the Government of India and the Secretary of State. The former wrote in 1884: " The succession to a Native State is invalid until it receives in some form the sanction of the British authorities." The latter reiterated it in 1891 in the following terms: " Every succession must be recognised by the British Government, and no succession is valid until recognition has been given." Thus in theory there was an interregnum on the death of a ruler of an Indian State and even as a son could not succeed until his claim was approved by the British Government.

The theory of paramountcy over the Indian States also served as the basis and justification of the claim of the British Government to interfere in their internal affairs whenever it was necessary to do so for ensuring good government. As the Paramount Power they had undertaken the responsibility of maintaining a high level of administration in the States. Previously the Company would let a State alone so long as it was loyal, and would not interfere in its internal administration, save that in extreme cases of misgovernment they would most probably annex it permanently. Under the Crown a State, besides being loyal, has to maintain a high standard of administration, and failure to do this would lead to the interference of the Paramount Authority. In addition to the cases of Barodā and Manipur discussed above, reference may be made to interference in later times in the States of Hyderābād, Kāshmīr and Alwār.

The new policy was very lucidly stated by Lord Reading in connection with the interference in the Nizām's State:

> " The right of the British Government to intervene in the internal affairs of Indian States is another instance of the consequence necessarily involved in the supremacy of the British Crown. The British Government have indeed shown again and again that they have no desire to exercise this right without grave reason. But the internal, no less than the external security which the Ruling Princes enjoy is due ultimately to the protecting power of the British Government, and where imperial interests are

concerned, or the general welfare of the people of a State is seriously and grievously affected by the action of its Government, it is with the Paramount Power that the ultimate responsibility of taking remedial action, if necessary, must lie. The varying degrees of internal sovereignty which the Rulers enjoy are all subject to the due exercise by the Paramount Power of this responsibility."

CHAPTER II

WHITEHALL AND THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA (1858–1905)

India under the Crown

1. The Home Government

THE Act of 1858 put an end to the dual authority exercised by the Board of Control, or rather its President, and the Court of Directors. A parliamentary minister, the Secretary of State for India, was now invested with the powers of supreme control over the Government of India. In view of the general ignorance of English politicians about India, and partly, no doubt, in order to control the exercise of such large powers and patronage by a single individual, a Council was set up to advise the Secretary of State. The Council of India included men of Indian experience. In order to give them independence in the exercise of their duty the members were appointed "during good behaviour". They were given specific powers, and their consent was needed for the appropriation and expenditure of the Indian revenue, and for the appointment of ordinary members of the Viceroy's Council. The Secretary of State was not, however, absolutely subject to his Council, and could act on his own authority in urgent and secret matters. It was, however, hoped that the Council would have an effective share in the determination of policy.

But it was soon apparent that the Secretary of State was in a position to ignore his Council on all vital matters. The position was legalised by the act of 1869, which took away most of the powers of the Council, and further provided that its members were to hold office only for a period of ten years, renewable at the pleasure of the Secretary of State. The change was clearly pointed out by Sir Charles Dilke in the House of Commons: "At the time the Council was appointed the idea was to curb the power of the Secretary of State; that feeling had passed away, and it was now recognised on all hands that the Council should be a consultative and not a controlling body."

The Secretary of State, like other ministers, was responsible to the British Parliament. But here, again, English politicians generally speaking possessed so poor a knowledge of Indian affairs, and took so little interest in them, that parliamentary control over the Secretary of State for India scarcely ever became a reality.

In practice, therefore, if not in law, the Secretary of State possessed unlimited authority over the Government of India. This had its natural reaction on the relations between the Home Government at Whitehall and the Government in India.

To a superficial observer the Act of 1858 meant nothing more to the Indian Government than a mere change of master. In reality, however, it brought about striking changes.

The concentration of the powers of the Court of Directors and the Board of Control in the hands of a minister of State led to important consequences. To serve two masters may be an irksome business, but it had its obvious advantages. Fully cognisant of the eternal rivalry between the two, a shrewd and able Governor-General could, and often did, play one against the other, and had his own way. Besides, the same rivalry between the authorities stood in the way of their formulating a strong and vigorous policy to which the Indian Government did not subscribe. Further, a minister of State was always likely to be a person of far greater weight than the President of the Board of Control. In the present instance, the Secretary of State, as we have seen above, exercised his large powers practically without any control and could naturally exercise a greater degree of influence. Besides, the Act of 1858 vested the Council of India with large powers over the financial policy of the Government of India. These powers gradually fell into the hands of the Secretary of State and enabled him to exercise an effective control over the Viceroy and his Council.

But in addition to legislative enactments, other factors were at work to enhance the powers of the Secretary of State. The establishment of a direct telegraph line between England and India in 1870 was an event of far-reaching importance. The delay in communication was a great advantage to the Government of India in so far as it of necessity left the initiation of policy in urgent matters to its own hands, and enabled it to confront the Secretary of State with accomplished facts. But all this was bound to change when the Secretary of State had to be kept constantly informed of the course of events in India, and was in a position to issue immediate orders. Henceforth the Secretary of State exercised a far more effective control over the administration of India than was the case before, and the Viceroy really tended to be a mere " agent " of the Secretary of State.

2. The Indian Government

When the Crown took the Government of India into its own hands in 1858, the supreme legislative and executive authority in India, as we have seen above, was vested in the Governor-General-in-Council. For executive powers it was composed of the Governor-General, the four o dinary members (three officials of ten years' standing and one barrister), and the

Commander-in-Chief, who was an extraordinary member. For legislative purposes six members had been added to this body in 1853.

The change of 1853 marks the modest beginning of a parliamentary system in India, and as such deserves special notice. As Cowell observed: " Discussion became oral instead of in writing; Bills were referred to Select Committees instead of to a single member; and legislative business was conducted in public instead of in secret."

There were, however, two grave defects in the Legislative Council. No Indian element was associated with it, and its knowledge of the local conditions outside Bengal was not adequate for making laws for other provinces.

The first of these defects was forcibly realised by many at the time of the Revolt of 1857–59. " The terrible events of the Mutiny brought home to men's minds the dangers arising from the entire exclusion of Indians from association with the legislation of the country." Enlightened Indians like Sir Syed Ahmad pointed out the twofold character of this danger. On the one hand it deprived the people of the means of entering any protest against any unpopular measure, while on the other hand the Government had no opportunity of explaining their aims and intentions, which were consequently misunderstood. Even English politicians endorsed the same view. In his able Minute of 1860, Sir Bartle Frere advocated the need of including Indians in the Legislative Council, in order to do away with " the perilous experiment of continuing to legislate for millions of people with few means of knowing, except by rebellion, whether the laws suit them or not ".

Apart from these inherent defects of the existing Legislative Council, difficulties soon arose which threatened to alter the whole structure of the Indian Government. These have been ably summed up in the following lines:

> " Contrary to the intentions of the framers of the Act of 1853, it (the Legislative Council) had developed into 'an Anglo-Indian House of Commons' questioning the Executive and its acts, and forcing it to lay even confidential papers before it. It had refused to submit legislative projects to the Secretary of State before their consideration in the Council, and had refused to pass any legislation required by the Secretary of State (or the Court of Directors before 1858); on the other hand it asserted its right of independent legislation."

The spirit of Independence displayed by the Legislative Council from the very beginning disturbed its author, Sir Charles Wood, the President of the Board of Control. " I do not look upon it," said he, " as some of the young Indians do, as the nucleus and beginning of a constitutional parliament in India." But Dalhousie pointed out that he had not " conceded to the Legislative Council any greater power than the law clearly confers upon it ". It has been very aptly observed that Wood " was neither the first

nor the last legislator to fail in limiting the consequences of a Bill to his intentions".

The state of things soon underwent a change. The Indian Councils Act of 1861 constituted the next landmark in the evolution of Legislative Councils in this country. It added a fifth ordinary non-official member to the Executive Council, and the power of the Secretary of State to appoint the Commander-in-Chief as an extraordinary member was continued. The powers of the Governor-General were considerably enlarged. With the sanction of his Council he could exercise all the executive powers of the Governor-General-in-Council. Further, the Act empowered him to make rules and orders for the transaction of the business of the Council. Lord Canning used this authority to introduce what is now known as the Portfolio System. By this system each member was placed in charge of one or more departments, and could finally dispose of minor matters in that department on his own authority, and matters of greater importance in consultation with the Viceroy, only the questions of general policy being referred to the Council for decision. In view of the large increase in business such a system was almost inevitable, but it resulted in a considerable diminution of the importance of the Council, and a corresponding increase in the power and influence of the Viceroy.

The legislative provisions of the Act of 1861 were far more important. For the purpose of making laws the Viceroy's Council was enlarged by the addition of "not less than six nor more than twelve additional members", of whom not less than half should be non-official members. These additional members were to be nominated by the Governor-General for two years.

The function of this Council was strictly limited to legislation, and the Act expressly forbade the transaction of any other business. It was empowered "to make laws and regulation for all persons whether British or native, foreigners or others, and for all places and things whatever within the said territories, and for all servants of the Government of India (afterwards extended to all British subjects) within the dominions of princes and States in alliance with Her Majesty".

This wide legislative power was subject, however, to several restrictions. In the first place the previous sanction of the Governor-General was necessary for introducing any legislation concerning certain specified subjects, such as Public Debt, Public Revenue, Indian religious rites, Military discipline and Policy towards Indian States.

Secondly, no laws could be made which infringed the authority of the Home Government or violated the provisions of certain Acts made by the Parliament.

Thirdly, the Governor-General had not only the power of vetoing any law passed by the Council, but was authorised, in cases of emergency, to issue ordinances which should have the same authority as any law passed by the Council.

Lastly, any Act passed by the Council might be disallowed by Her Majesty.

The Act of 1861 restored to the Governments of Bombay and Madras the power of making "laws and regulations" for the peace and good government of these Presidencies, subject, of course, to the same restrictions as put upon the Governor-General's Council. In addition, the Provincial Councils had to obtain previous sanction of the Governor-General before making regulations on such all India subjects as currency, copyright, posts and telegraphs Penal Code, etc. For the purpose of legislation the Executive Council of the Governor was enlarged by the addition of the Advocate-General, and "not less than four nor more than eight" members, nominated by the Governor, of whom at least half should be non-official members.

The Act authorised the Governor-General-in-Council to create similar Legislative Councils not only in the remaining provinces such as Bengal, the North-Western Provinces (now the United Provinces), and the Punjab, but also in new provinces, if any, which it was empowered to constitute. In pursuance of this a Legislative Council was established in the three provinces, in 1862, 1886 and 1898 respectively.

It must be admitted that the Act of 1861 was retrograde in many respects, and deprived the Legislative Council of any independent power. It ceased to exercise any control or check upon the Executive, and even its legislative, functions were circumscribed by too many restrictions. But in spite of all its defects the Indian Councils Act of 1861 must always be regarded as a memorable one. It gave the framework to the Government of India which it retained up to the very end, and all the subsequent changes were made within that framework. It ushered in one of the great developments that distinguished the subsequent reforms of administration in this country, viz., the admission of Indians into the higher Councils of the Government. Although not expressly provided for in the Act, there was no definition of the non-official element of the Legislative Council, which accordingly could include Indians. Dalhousie had urged the inclusion of Indians in the Council created by the Act of 1853, but without success. Evidently the Revolt of 1857–59 changed the views at home in this respect, and in 1862 Canning nominated the Mahārājā of Patiālā, the Rājā of Benares, and Sir Dinkar Rāo to the newly constituted Legislative Council.

It is not necessary to describe in detail the various legislative measures during the thirty years that followed (1861–1891). Among the notable changes may be mentioned the considerable increase of legislative authority both of the Viceroy and his Council. By the Indian Councils Act of 1870, the Governor-General-in-Council was empowered to pass regulations without reference to the Legislative Council. The same Act also repeated and more clearly defined the power of the Viceroy to override the decisions of the majority of his Council and to adopt and carry into execution or suspend or reject, even against the opinion of the majority, any measure affecting "the safety, tranquillity or interests of the British possessions in India, or any part thereof".

The Act of 1874 provided for the addition of a sixth ordinary member to the Viceroy's Council, "the member for Public Works".

The same period of thirty years, however, witnessed the first great national movement in India and the foundation of the Indian National Congress, to which detailed reference will be made later. The newly-roused political consciousness of the Indians manifested itself in demands for constitutional rights formulated by the Congress. The Congress put in the forefront of its programme the reform of the Legislative Councils, both local and central, especially on the following lines:

1. The establishment of councils in provinces, other than Bengal, Bombay and Madras.
2. The expansion of the councils with a large proportion of elected members.
3. Grant of additional powers to the councils, especially the right of discussing the Budget and of eliciting information by means of interpellations.

To meet these demands, at least partially, Lord Dufferin suggested some measures to the Home Government which led to the Indian Councils Act of 1892, another great landmark in the history of constitutional development in India.

By this Act the number of additional members, both in the Supreme and local Councils, was slightly increased, the maximum being fixed at sixteen in the case of the Supreme Council, twenty in the case of Bombay, Madras, and Bengal, and fifteen for the North Western Provinces and Oudh, where a Legislative Council had been established in 1886. The increase was much below the expectations not only of the Congress, but even of many English politicians who sympathised with the political aspirations of the Indians.

Far more important was, however, the change in the mode of appointing these members. The principle of election demanded by the Congress was not directly conceded. But the Act authorised the Governor-General-in-Council to prescribe the method of appointing the additional members, and the Government members explained, in the course of the discussion of the Bill in the House of Commons, that under this clause it would be possible for the Governor-General to provide for the election of additional members. As a matter of fact, Lord Lansdowne (1888–1894) utilised this power in having eight members of the local councils elected by Municipalities, District Boards, Chambers of Commerce, Universities, etc., and four members of the Supreme Council elected by the non-official members of the local councils.

The Act of 1892 also conceded to the members of the Legislative Councils the right of discussing the Budget and asking questions on matters of public interest.

Although the Act of 1892 fell far short of the demands made by the Indian

National Congress, it was a great advance upon the existing state of things. By conceding the principle of election, and giving the Legislative Councils some control over the Executive, it paved the way for further reforms on these lines which were destined to place in the hands of Indians a large measure of control over the administration of the country.

CHAPTER III

INTERNAL ADMINISTRATION, 1858–1905

1. Recruitment for the Public Services

THE assumption of the direct administration of India by the Crown led to great changes both in the spirit and details of internal administration. The administrative machinery was gradually organised with a thoroughness not possible under the Company's regime, and the administrative principles and political ideals of England were applied to a large extent. The Indian administration became more efficient and more up-to-date. The old rivalry and jealousy between the Company and the Board of Control disappeared, and the unitary control of Parliament was established.

But the picture has its dark side also. During the old regime the periodical renewal of the Charter of the East India Company afforded an opportunity for Parliament to scruntinise affairs in India with a jealous eye. But as soon as the Secretary of State was put in sole charge of India, it ceased to evoke that interest. Theoretically, no doubt, the House of Commons was responsible for the administration of India, but few persons took an interest in matters affecting this country. In the days of the Company, a Select Committee was appointed by Parliament to report on the administration. They went thoroughly into the whole subject, exposed abuses, and suggested remedies which were frequently adopted in the new Charter. But now the Secretary submitted an annual report before the whole House. Every member was supposed to take interest in it, but as often happens, everybody's business became nobody's business.

Its effect on the large increase in the powers of the Secretary of State has been referred to above, but the internal administration of India was also profoundly affected by it. The Indian officials were now responsible only to to the Secretary of State, and, so long as they could satisfy him, had not to fear any other authority. The Secretary could hardly exercise any effective control over the details of administration from such a distance, but he had to defend the actions of the officials as the ultimate responsibility devolved upon him. The result was the growth of an all-powerful Bureaucracy in India headed by the members of the Superior Indian Civil Service. This service soon became a powerful corporation, and its members became—in the words of Blunt—"the practical owners of India, irremovable, irresponsible, and

amenable to no authority but that of their fellow members". The members of this service were no doubt very able, and, generally speaking, honest men. But the position in which they found themselves invested them with a superiority complex, and a wide gulf was created between the rulers and the ruled. That sympathy and mutual understanding between the two, which lie at the root of all good administration, were at a discount.

Unfortunately other causes were at work to accentuate the isolation of the higher British officials. In the days of the Company English officials mixed freely with Indians, and there was a genuine good feeling and often friendship between them. The dark horrors of the Revolt generated a feeling of aversion towards Indians in the minds of the British. Perhaps this feeling would have been weakened in the normal course, and might have ultimately disappeared. But steam navigation, the Suez Canal, the telegraph and the overland route, all served to bring the British in closer touch with their home. They were no longer exiles in a foreign land, but in direct and constant touch with their own country. Gradually an English society grew up in big towns. All these factors did away with the necessity of making friends with Indians, and the British official led a more and more exclusive life so far as the Indian people were concerned. His time was divided between his office and club and he had hardly any social intercourse with Indians. In spite of long residence in India, he remained to all intents and purposes a foreigner, and knew little of their feelings, sentiments and aspirations. Blunt very correctly observed that " the Anglo-Indian official of the Company's days loved India in a way no Queen's official dreams of doing now; and loving it, he served it better ".

The Indians naturally concluded that this state of things could only be improved by the appointment of a larger number of Indians in the public offices. The Charter Act of 1833 legalised the appointment of Indians even to the highest offices of State. But the provisions in the Act of 1793, still unrepealed, laid down that "none but covenanted servants of the Company could hold any office with a salary of more than £800 a year". Thus no Indian could fill any high post unless he were a regular official who had entered into covenant with the East India Company, or, after 1858, with the Secretary of State. Formerly these officers were nominated partly by the Directors and partly by the Board of Control, and after nomination they received a training for two years at the East India College at Haileybury. The system of open competitive examination for these appointments was introduced in 1853 and reaffirmed in 1858. The competition was open to all natural-born subjects of Her Majesty, whether European or Indian. The maximum age for admission was at first twenty-three. In 1859 it was lowered to twenty-two, and the selected candidates were to remain on probation in England for a year. In 1866 the maximum age was still further lowered to twenty-one, and the probationers had to go through a special course of training at an approved University for two years.

It was extremely difficult for Indians to pass this examination. The journey to England was not only expensive and unfamiliar but, in the case of the Hindus, was frowned upon by the more orthodox leaders of the community. To compete with English boys in an examination conducted through the medium of English in an English University was indeed a formidable task. It is no wonder, therefore, that comparatively few Indians were successful.

The repercussion of this state of things on the political movement in India will be discussed in a later chapter. The British Government also realised the inadequacy of the Indian element in the Superior Civil Service. In 1870 an Act was passed authorising the appointment of Indians to the higher offices without any examination, but effect was given to this only in 1879 under circumstances to be related later (p. 880).

The rules adopted in 1879 ordained "that a proportion not exceeding one-sixth of the total number of covenanted Civil Servants appointed in any year by the Secretary of State should be natives selected in India by the local governments subject to the approval of the Governor-General-in-Council". These officers were called "Statutory Civil Servants" and were recruited from "young men of good family and social position possessed of fair abilities and education". The system was, however, subject to the same defects from which all systems of nomination were bound to suffer. Indians themselves preferred open competitive examination. But in order to give Indians a fair and equitable chance, they recommended that there should be simultaneous examinations both in England and India. For the same reason they were against the lowering of the maximum age of admission below twenty-one as it would adversely affect the Indian candidates who were to be examined in a foreign tongue. The lowering of the maximum age limit to nineteen in 1877 was regarded as a deliberate attempt to shut out Indians, and led to that agitation which culminated in the Congress movement. The Congress vigorously took up the question of simultaneous examinations and employment of Indians in larger numbers.

In 1886 Lord Dufferin appointed a "Public Services Commission" to investigate the problem with Sir Charles Atchison, then Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, as its President. The Commission rejected the idea of simultaneous examinations for covenanted service, and advised the abolition of the Statutory Civil Service. They proposed that a number of posts hitherto reserved for convenanted service should be thrown open to a local service to be called the Provincial Civil Service, which would be separately recruited in every province either by promotion from lower ranks or by direct recruitment. The terms Covenanted and Uncovenanted were replaced by Imperial and Provincial, and below the latter would be a Subordinate Civil Service.

These recommendations were accepted. The Covenanted Civil Service was henceforth known as the "Civil Service of India", and the Provincial Service was called after the particular province, as, for example, the Bengal Civil Service. A list was prepared of posts reserved for the Civil Service of

India, but open to the new Provincial Service, and local governments were empowered to appoint an Indian to any such "listed post". In other branches of administration, such as Education, Police, Public Works and Medical departments, too, there were similar divisions into Imperial, Provincial, and Subordinate services. The first was mainly filled by Englishmen, and the other two almost exclusively by Indians.

This system remained in being with slight changes till the end of British rule. It improved the standard of service, but failed to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the Indians for employment in larger numbers in higher offices of State.

In 1893, the House of Commons passed a resolution in favour of simultaneous examinations in England and India for the Indian Civil Service. The resolution was forwarded by the Secretary of State to the Government of India for opinion. Lord Lansdowne's Government, after consulting Provincial Governments, definitely opposed the principle of the resolution. "They maintained that material reduction of the European staff then employed was incompatible with the safety of the British rule. The system of unrestricted competition in examination would not only dangerously weaken the British element in the Civil Service, but would also practically exclude from the service Muhammadans, Sikhs and other races, accustomed to rule by tradition, and possessed of exceptional strength of character, but deficient in literary education." Nothing came of the proposal, and more than a quarter of a century had elapsed before any step was taken in this direction.

2. Local Self-Government

From time immemorial ideas of local self-government prevailed in India to a far greater extent than anywhere else in the world. The villages and towns were small States in miniature where all the local needs for sanitation, communication, the judiciary and the police were served by assemblies of the people themselves with a chief executive officer.

During the turmoil that followed in the wake of the dissolution of the Mughul Empire, these self-governing organisations almost entirely disappeared from towns and greatly decayed in villages. The British Government tried to keep up the village assemblies wherever they were in working order, and revived them in places where they were wanting. But they were confronted with the task of evolving a definite system of local government both for the vast rural areas as well as for towns.

To begin with, the Government adopted no definite system in the administration of local affairs in the rural areas. They worked through the existing institutions or improvised others as the need was felt. In Bengal regulations were passed in 1816 and 1819 authorising the Government to levy money for

the maintenance of ferries and the repair and construction of roads, bridges and drains. In administering the fund so raised, Government were advised by local Committees, with the Magistrate as Secretary, which they appointed in each district.

Outside Bengal, the necessary amount was raised by imposing a cess or small percentage on land revenue. In 1869 the matter was put on a definite basis in Bombay by means of legislation. It provided for expenditure on public works by legalising the cesses and set up committees for the administration of funds, not only for the district as a whole but also for its sub-divisions.

A great stimulus was given to the development of local self-government by the Government of India's Resolution of 1870. Within a year, Acts were passed in various provinces on the lines of that of the Bombay Government. Existing cesses were legalised and even increased. For the administration of the funds, Committees were set up for the district as a whole, but not for smaller areas as in Bomaby. These Committees were all nominated by the Government and controlled by them. They consisted of both officials and non-officials and had an official Chairman.

In Bengal the cess was imposed for the first time by the new Act and a great hue and cry was raised that it was a violation of the Permanent Settlement. The Government partly yielded and decided to restrict the cess only to the amount required for the roads. Thus the road-cess, as it was called in Bengal, could not be diverted to purposes of primary education as was done in other provinces.

The system introduced in 1871 was no doubt a distinct improvement upon the existing situation. Much was done to improve the communications, sanitation and education of the localities. But there were several grave defects. The Committees were entirely dominated by officialdom, and popular wishes and feelings had no scope in them. Besides, the area served by them was too large, and the private members had very inadequate knowledge of, and consequently little interest in, the local affairs of a large part of the area.

Lord Ripon made an earnest endeavour to remove these defects and to introduce a real element of local self-government somewhat on the lines of English law. His ideas were laid down in the shape of a Government Resolution in May, 1882. The two essential features of this new plan were:

(1) The sub-division, not the district, should be the maximum area served by one Committee or local board, with primary boards, under it, serving very small areas, so that each member of it might possess knowledge of, and interest in, its affairs.
(2) The local boards should consist of a large majority of elected non-official members, and be presided over by a non-official Chairman.

Here was a real beginning of self-government. But unfortunately the principles underlying this resolution were not fully given effect in many of the provinces. The legislation that followed differed in different provinces. In the Central Provinces the Chairman became non-official and the principle of election was adopted to a certain extent. In other provinces the old system was continued, and only a small number of members were elected. Everywhere the district continued to be the area of the local boards. In Bengal alone an attempt was made to carry Lord Ripon's principles to the fullest extent, but the Bill introduced for the purpose was vetoed by the Secretary of State. Under the Act finally passed in 1885 the District Boards continued to function under the chairmanship of the District Magistrates.

The ground for the great departure from the principles of the Resolution of May, 1882, was everywhere the demand for efficiency. To a certain extent this was perhaps achieved. But the value of these new principles lay in a quite different direction. Their author, Lord Ripon, stated it quite clearly in the following words:

" It is not primarily with a view to improvement in administration that the measure is put forward and supported. It is chiefly desirable as a measure of political and popular education."

The liberal views of Ripon were not, unfortunately, shared by either the local governments or the authorities in England. The high hopes raised in the minds of the Indians were thus dashed to the ground. But the Congress took up this question and pressed it upon the Government year after year.

Municipalities

Up to the time of Lord Ripon the local administration of towns, like that of rural areas, was not conducted on any uniform or definite principle. In big towns there was a municipal Committee nominated by the Government with the District Magistrate as Chairman. Their power of taxation for meeting local needs was based in some cases on legislative enactments, but in others on local usage and customs. In most cases the Government had complete control over the administration, though in a few areas the limit of Government interference was prescribed by law.

Lord Ripon's Resolution of May, 1882, aimed at the introduction of principles of self-government in municipal administration as in the case of rural Boards. He proposed that while the ultimate supervision, control, and superintendence should be left in the hands of the Government, the actual municipal administration should be entrusted to the elected representatives of the people. Under a non-official Chairman, the people should be trained to govern themselves through their own representatives. He further proposed that the police charges should be met by the Government, and the municipalities should busy themselves with education, sanitation, provision of light,

roads and drinking water and such other objects of public utility.

Lord Ripon's ideals were realised to a large extent. Acts were passed for the various provinces, providing for the compulsory election of a large proportion—varying from one-half to three-quarters—of municipal Commissioners. The Acts also provided for the election of a Chairman. This was, however, only a permissive clause, and the power was not actually granted in many cases. Even where such power was granted, the district officer was often elected as the Chairman. In course of time, however, non-official Chairmen became the rule rather than the exception.

Thus Lord Ripon made a real beginning in the direction of local self-government in modern India. His ideas were not given full effect, but he sowed the seeds which ultimately germinated in a real development of local self-government.

Presidency Towns

The development of self-government in the three Presidency towns of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras requires separate treatment. Being the earliest seats of British authority in India, the history of their local government goes back to a much earlier period, and shows an evolution of a very different character from that of the other towns of British India.

Towards the close of the eighteenth century, a Parliamentary Statute authorised the Governor-General to appoint justices of the peace in these towns. They provided for sanitation and the police, and were empowered to levy rates on owners and occupiers of houses for meeting the necessary expenditure.

The arrangement was inadequate and unsatisfactory, and two Acts were passed in 1856 for the conservancy and improvement of the towns and for the better assessment and collection of rates. Three Commissioners were appointed in each town, and in the Act for Calcutta special provisions were made for gas-lighting and the construction of sewers.

From this time the development in the three towns followed different lines, and we may treat them separately.

Calcutta

The new arrangement proving ineffective, the justices of the peace were again vested with general control, but the executive power was left in the hands of a Chairman appointed by the Government. The Chairman was also made the Commissioner of Police. Under such a strong executive authority great improvements were made, and Sir Stewart Hogg laid the foundations of a proper system of drainage and water supply.

The constitution, however, did not work well. The relation between the executive and the large number of justices of the peace was not clearly defined and there was constant conflict between the two. By an Act of 1876 the Corporation of Calcutta was reconstituted. It consisted of seventy-two members, two-thirds of whom were elected by rate-payers. In 1882 the number of elected members was raised to fifty, and the jurisdiction of the Municipality was extended by the addition of suburban areas.

The progressive development of the principles of self-government in the administration of the city of Calcutta was suddenly checked by Lord Curzon. By an Act passed in 1899 the number of members directly elected by the rate-payers was reduced to half the total strength, and the Chairman, nominated by the Government, was vested with large independent powers. The Corporation could only fix the rate of assessment and lay down the general policy. In the details of administration the only check upon the Chairman was a General Committee of twelve, of whom four were appointed by the elected Commissioners, four by the other Commissioners, and four by the Government.

The grounds for thus curtailing the powers of the people were that there was too much talk and too little action in the Corporation, and that the necessary driving power could only be secured by a strong independent executive unfettered by the control of the Corporation or its special Committees.

Needless to add, the measure evoked the strongest protest from the public. Mr. Surendranath Banerjea uttered one of his most eloquent denunciations when this measure was discussed in the Bengal Legislative Council. On the last day of the debate, 27th September, while opposing the bill for the last time, he remarked that the date "will be remembered by future generations of Bengalees as that which marks the extinction of local self-government" in the city of Calcutta.

As a protest against the measure, twenty-eight members of the Corporation, including Surendranath, tendered their resignation. By a curious irony of fate, it was left to Surendranath, as a Minister, to undo the great wrong—twenty-four years later.

Bombay

In Bombay, as in Calcutta, the old system was revived in 1865. Five hundred justices of the peace formed a corporate body for the administration of the town, with a highly-paid official, called Commissioner, as Chairman, and an independent Controller of Accounts. The system did not work well. The Controller of Accounts scarcely exercised any effective control, while the Corporation was too unwieldy for the purpose of check or guidance.

The constitution was changed in 1872. The strength of the Corporation

was reduced to sixty-four members, of whom half were elected by the rate-payers, one-fourth were elected by the resident justices, and the remaining one-fourth were nominated by the Government. The executive authority was vested, as before, in the Commissioner, but the post of the Controller of Accounts was abolished. Instead, provision was made for the weekly audit of accounts by a standing Committee of the Corporation, and monthly audit by paid professional auditors.

This constitution worked fairly well and continued with slight changes till the end of the nineteenth century.

Madras

In Madras the system of government by three Commissioners continued till 1867. By an Act passed in that year, the town was divided into eight wards, and four councillors were appointed for each by the Government.

In 1878 half the members of the Corporation were elected by the rate-payers, but the President and two Vice-Presidents were all salaried officials appointed by the Government. In 1884 the principle of election was further extended, and twenty-four out of thirty-two members of the Corporation were elected by the rate-payers.

During Lord Curzon's Viceroyalty reaction followed, and the Corporation of Madras was reconstituted on the lines of the Calcutta Municipal Act of 1899.

Thus after various trials a system of government was evolved for the three presidency towns which had the same essential features, viz., a large Corporation with a proportion of elected members, a strong independent executive authority vested in a Government nominee, with adequate safeguards for checking of accounts and statutory provision for the performance of essential duties, such as sanitation, water-supply, etc. The Government had the right to intervene in case of gross negligence or mismanagement.

3. Financial Administration

Important changes were introduced in the financial system of India by the Act of 1858. The Secretary of State in Council had now the supreme control of financial administration, and, subject to some discretionary powers vested in the Government of India, no expenditure of Indian revenues could be incurred without the sanction of the India Council. Subject to this control, the Government of India exercised supreme authority over financial administration in India, the Provincial Governments having no power spend without the sanction of the Governor-General-in-Council. The system of budget was introduced in 1860, and the appropriation of revenues

under different items, as provided therein, had to be implicitly followed by the local authorities.

This highly centralised system did not work well. The Provincial Governments having no discretion in matters of expenditure, had little incentive to increase of income or economy in expenditure. The Government of India did not possess the requisite knowledge to make an equitable distribution of the available resources over such a vast country. It was inevitable, under these circumstances, that there should be constant friction between the local and central Governments. Strachey has very justly observed that under this system "the distribution of the public income degenerated into something like a scramble in which the most violent had the advantage with little attention to reason".

These glaring defects led to some amount of decentralisation between 1871 and 1877. Under the new scheme centralised subjects like Post Office and Railways were wholly taken over by the Central Government. The receipts from these departments, together with some other sources of revenue, as salt, opium, and customs, were retained wholly by the Central Government. The revenues from other sources, e.g. land-revenue, excise, stamps, forests and registration, were divided between the Provincial and Central Governments, the share of each being determined according to the needs of particular provinces. This settlement of respective shares was subject to periodical review and readjustment. Under this system the Provincial Governments had to manage their expenses from the revenues assigned to them. They had thus not only more freedom and latitude in spending the revenues they collected, but also a direct interest in increasing the revenues and economising in their expenses.

Of the various heads of revenue referred to above, the land-revenue in different parts of British India and the income derived from the Government monopoly of salt and opium have already been dealt with. The stamp-revenue was really a direct tax on judicial proceedings and commercial transactions; people filing suits in law-courts or entering into business transactions had to affix stamps of specified values on the documents in order to make them legally valid.

The revenue under the head of customs was derived from an *ad valorem* duty on various articles exported from or imported into India. The rate of this duty varied from time to time. The most important was the import duty on cotton goods which yielded an income equivalent to nearly two-thirds of the total income from imports. But as soon as cotton mills were established in India, this duty adversely affected the import of cotton goods manufactured in England. The English manufacturers brought pressure upon the Home Government, and the Government of India was persuaded to adopt the policy of Free Trade then current in England. Consequently, in 1882 all the import duties were abolished, save on such commodities as wine and salt on which internal taxes were levied.

But it proved exceedingly difficult to compensate for the loss of customs duty from other sources. The heavy fall in the price of silver, which formed the standard of currency in India, the military expenditure caused by wars in Burma and the threatening attitude of the Russians in the north-west, and the provisions of the Famine Insurance Fund—all imposed heavy strains upon Indian finances. In order to balance the Budget, the Government of India was forced, in 1894, to reimpose a general import duty at the rate of 5 per cent *ad valorem*. In order to safeguard the interests of English manufacturers of cotton goods, an equivalent excise duty was levied on the cotton goods manufactured in Indian mills.

The abolition of the import duties on cotton goods, and still more, the levy of duty on cotton goods manufactured in India when the import duty was reimposed, were so obviously unjust to Indian interests that even the Council of the Viceroy protested against the measures. In both instances the British Cabinet forced their views upon the unwilling Government of India. In the latter case Sir Henry Fowler, the Secretary of State, enunciated the general policy as follows:

"When once a certain line of policy has been adopted under the direction of the (British) Cabinet, it becomes the clear duty of every member of the Government of India to consider not what that policy ought to be, but how effect may best be given to the policy that has been decided on."

In addition to the revenues mentioned above, the income-tax proved to be a valuable source of receipts. It was introduced in 1860 as a temporary measure, to cope with the financial stresses caused by the Revolt. At first it was in the form of a general levy of 4 per cent on all incomes of Rs. 500, or above, and 2 per cent on all incomes between Rs. 200 and Rs. 500. It was abolished in 1865 but revived again two years later, in the modified shape of a licence tax on trades and professions. A general income-tax was reimposed in 1869, but again dropped. Ultimately the financial difficulties again forced the Government in 1886 to impose a tax on all incomes other than those derived from agriculture. The tax has since been continued, though the rates have varied from time to time.

A few words may be said regarding the vexed problem of currency. During the early period of Mughul rule, gold *mohurs* and silver rupees were both current in Northern India, though gold was the principal currency in Southern India. The rise of numerous independent kingdoms on the break-up of the Mughul Empire led to the introduction of a multiplicity of coins, as the issue of coins was regarded as one of the insignia of sovereignty. It has been estimated that as many as 994 different types of coins, of both gold and silver, were current in India.

Its disadvantages for purposes of trade and commerce were obvious, and the East India Company tried to solve the difficulty by issuing both gold and silver coins with a definite legal ratio, weight, and fineness. But owing to fluctuations in the value of the two metals it proved exceedingly difficult

to maintain the legal ratio between the two types of coins. Gradually the gold *mohur*, being undervalued, disappeared. In 1818 the silver rupee of 180 grains ($\frac{1}{1}\frac{1}{2}$th fine) was substituted for the gold *pagoda* of Madras, and in 1835 the rupee of the present form and size, but having the same weight and fineness as that of 1818, was made the sole legal tender throughout the British territories in India. The Government mints coined this rupee for the public, the value of the bullion being identical with its legal value.

In 1841 an attempt was made to reintroduce gold coins, and gold *mohurs* were accepted for public payments at the rate of fifteen rupees to a *mohur*. But the price of gold fell owing to discoveries of the metal in Australia and California in 1848–1849, and Lord Dalhousie definitely abandoned the experiment of 1841. Gold was thus given up as the medium of exchange. But this led to scarcity of money, and trade suffered. Several proposals were made to introduce a gold currency in India, instead of silver, but no effect was given to them.

From 1874 the problem became acute. The adoption of a gold standard by most European countries, and an increase in the output of silver, depreciated the value of silver in terms of gold. Thus while a rupee was equivalent to two shillings of English money in 1871, its value fell to 1*s*. 2*d*. in 1892. In view of the extensive trade of India with foreign countries which had a gold currency, the situation appeared desperate. In 1878 the Government of India recommended to the Secretary of State the introduction of a gold currency in India, but the latter rejected the proposal. In 1893 the Government introduced the following important changes in its currency on the recommendations of the Herschell Committee:

1. Indian mints were closed to the free coinage of gold and silver for the public.
2. Gold was received in mints in exchange for rupees at the ratio of 1*s*. 4*d*. to the rupee.
3. Sovereigns were received in payment of public dues at the rate of Rs. 15 for a sovereign.
4. Issue of currency notes in exchange for gold coins or bullion at the same rate.

The result of these measures was that although gold was not yet made legal tender it became the standard of value and the exchange value of rupees ceased to coincide with the actual price of silver.

The new measures were regarded as first steps towards the ultimate adoption of a gold currency. Another Committee was appointed in 1898 under Sir Henry Fowler. According to its recommendations, adopted in 1899, both sovereigns and rupees were made unlimited legal tender at the rate of 1*s*. 4*d*. to the rupee, and the mints were opened only to the free coinage of gold. A Gold Standard Reserve was formed in 1900 out of the profits

accruing from the coinage of rupees for the Government, which was resumed.

But even this did not solve the problem of Indian currency. Other changes were made in the twentieth century, and even to-day it constitutes one of the most disputed questions in Indian economics.

4. Higher Standard of Government

The transfer of the government of India from the Company to the Crown effected, as we have seen, a closer association between the Governments of India and England. In course of time, both in theory as well as in practice, the Indian Government came to be treated almost as a subordinate branch of the British Government. The Secretary of State, Sir Henry Fowler, stated in unequivocal language that the Government of India must always abide by the decision of the British Cabinet, even when it was regarded by them as injurious to the interests of India. Another Secretary of State made a similar observation as regards foreign policy. It was inevitable that in formulating policies and lines of action the British Cabinet should be mostly guided by the paramount consideration of the interests of Britain, and, not unoften, Indian interests would be sacrificed for Imperial considerations. This was particularly noticeable in matters affecting trade, manufacture, currency and foreign policy, and in a less degree in other branches of administration.

But against these undoubted evils we must set off the equally undoubted advantages that accrued to India from the same causes. The close and intimate association with the British Government almost revolutionised the Government of India by introducing those higher administrative ideals and the " modern " spirit which distinguished Europe from Asia in the nineteenth century. The British Government naturally tried to impose the same high standard of administrative efficiency in India which had been evolved in their own country, and the enlightened liberal humanistic spirit of the West did not fail to make its influence felt in India. The scientific inventions of the West were also rapidly utilised in India to increase her material resources. In short, England served as the medium through which the modern progressive spirit of Europe remodelled the age-long inert medieval form of government in India. This process had no doubt begun even before the assumption of the government of India by the Crown, but there were no appreciable effects and notable transformations until the latter part of the nineteenth century. The new spirit can best be understood with reference to some typical measures of the Government to which we now turn.

We may first consider the measures dictated by a humanitarian spirit.

A. Restriction of Intoxicating Drugs

The ideals of temperance were sedulously propagated both in England and India, and there was a large and insistent demand by a section of the English

public for the complete abolition of the use of opium, hemp, and alcohol in India. The Government of India derived large profits from the monopoly of the opium trade in China and the Straits, and the excise duty on opium, alcohol, and hemp in India. Nevertheless it was forced to yield to public opinion to a certain extent. A Royal Commission was appointed in 1894 to examine the matter. An agreement was concluded with China in 1907 for the gradual decrease and ultimate extinction of the opium trade. As regards home consumption of the three intoxicating drugs, the Government refused to accept the scheme of total abolition, but adopted a definite policy of restricting and controlling their use by imposing a high excise duty and licensing the retail trade in the commodities. It openly declared that " its settled policy was to minimise temptation for the abstainer and to discourage excess among others and that no considerations of revenue could be allowed to hamper this policy".

B. Factory Legislation

Students of English history are aware of the continued agitation in England for reducing the hours of work of factory workers and providing them with other amenities of life. By a series of laws the British Government forced the mill-owners to improve the lot of their workers even at a considerable pecuniary loss. In the same spirit the Government of India also passed several Acts to improve the lot of factory-workers in India. By the Acts passed in 1881 and 1891 the hours of work for women and children were limited, and the local governments were authorised to make rules for the supply of good drinking water and the maintenance of proper ventilation and cleanliness in the factories.

C. Famine Relief

Perhaps the most important achievement of Indian administration during the period under review was the formation of a definite system of famine relief. In an agricultural country like India, famine must have proved a great scourge to its people from times immemorial. The statement of Megasthenes that famine never visits India can hardly be regarded as accurate, but perhaps the Greek writer was misled by the fact that the rigours of famine were not so severely felt over a wide region, and were mostly confined to local areas. With the growth of population and the diminution of industrial activity, the periodical famines assumed more threatening proportions. We have no accurate information as to the devastation caused by these up to the commencement of the British period. A terrible famine broke out in Bengal in 1770 and nearly one-third of the population fell

victims to it. During the next century famines occurred in different parts of India. The year 1866–1867 witnessed a severe famine which took a heavy toll of human lives in Orissa, and spread all along the eastern coast from Calcutta to Madras. During the next ten years there were local famines in the United Provinces, the Punjab and Rājputāna in 1868–1869, and in Northern Bihār in 1873.

Then followed another terrible famine in 1876 which lasted for nearly two years, and extended over a wide area in Madras, Mysore, Hyderābād, Bombay, and the United Provinces. On all these occasions various measures were adopted by the Government to afford relief to the people, but they were not very effective. It was observed that in the absence of definite principles and well-thought-out methods of work, the relief afforded in various areas was neither uniform nor even commensurate with the expenditure involved. In Bombay, for example, more human lives were saved than in Madras at less than half the cost. The Governor-General, Lord Lytton, rightly held that it was necessary to formulate general principles of famine relief, and appointed a strong Commission under General Sir Richard Strachey for this purpose. The Commission reported in 1880, and its recommendations formed the basis of the Famine Code promulgated in 1883 by the Government of India, and of the various provincial famine codes prepared in following years.

The Commission started with the fundamental principle that it is the duty of the State to offer relief to the needy in times of famine. The relief was to be administered in the shape of providing work for able-bodied men and distributing food or money to the aged and infirm. For the first, schemes of relief-work should be prepared in advance, so that actual operations may begin immediately after famine breaks out. These works should be of permanent utility, and on an extensive scale, so as to give employment to a large number of persons. Local works, such as excavation of ponds or raising embankments, etc., in villages might also be undertaken for the employment of persons who were not fit to be sent out on larger works. It was specially emphasised that the people should be provided with work before their physical efficiency had deteriorated through starvation.

Further relief was to be provided by suspension and remission of land-revenue and rents, and offer of loans for purchase of seedgrain and bullocks.

The Commission held that in order to prevent waste and extravagance in affording relief, a large share of the cost involved should be borne by local authorities, and the Central Government would only supplement the provincial funds after carefully examining the resources and abilities of the province. In order further to bring home to the people concerned a sense of responsibility, the Commission recommended that relief should be administered through the representatives of the tax-payers who were to provide the major part of the funds.

In order to meet the heavy unforeseen expenditure caused by famine, it

was decided to set apart fifteen millions of rupees every year in order to constitute the " Famine Relief and Insurance Fund ".

The principles of the Famine Code were put into effective operation during the minor famines that occurred in subsequent years, and the terrible famines of 1896–1897 and 1899–1900. The famine of 1896–1897 affected the United Provinces, Bihār, the Central Provinces, Madras and Bombay, the area under acute distress measuring about 125,000 square miles with a population of thirty-four millions. During 1899–1900 Bombay, the Central Provinces, the Punjab, Rājputāna, Barodā and the Central Indian principalities suffered in varying degrees. Relief measures were undertaken on an extensive scale and Lord Curzon, estimated " that one-fourth of the entire population of India had come, to a greater or less degree, within the radius of relief operations ".

After the famine of 1896–1897, a Commission was appointed under Sir James Lyall. It fully approved of the principles adopted in 1880, suggesting merely some alterations in the detailed working of the scheme.

Another Commission was appointed in 1900 under Sir Antony MacDonnell. It also endorsed the principles of 1880, but laid stress on the benefits occurring from early suspension of land-revenue and rents, and early distribution of advances for purchase of seed-grain and cattle. It recommended the appointment of a Famine Commissioner in a province where relief operations were likely to be adopted on an extensive scale. Among various other recommendations of the Commission, the following may be regarded as the more important:

(*a*) In particular circumstances preference should be given to local works in a village over large public works which had hitherto been the main feature of relief operations.

(*b*) Non-official assistance should be utilised on a larger scale in the matter of distributing relief.

(*c*) Establishment of agricultural banks and introduction of improved methods of agriculture.

(*d*) Wide extension of irrigation work.

These recommendations were accepted and acted upon by the Government. Thus a great step was taken to prevent and combat famine in India. It may be added that the extension of railways also served as an important means of famine relief by facilitating the transport of grains to the affected province, and their distribution to the various areas where they were badly needed.

We may next turn to activities of the Government directed towards improving the material resources of the country with the aid of scientific discoveries.

D. Railways

The most important among these is the extension of the railway system. Since the very modest beginning made by Dalhousie, 36,000 miles of railway were constructed at a total cost of 350 millions sterling. To begin with, these enterprises were left to private efforts. Private Companies were encouraged to undertake them on a guarantee given by the Government of India that if their net profits fell below 5 per cent, the balance should be paid by the Government. In return for this the Government secured certain privileges. If the profits of the Company exceeded the guaranteed 5 per cent, the Government would be entitled to half the excess profits. Further, the Government could exercise control over the management of the railway lines, and purchase them at a fixed rate at the end of a stipulated period, usually twenty-five years.

At the beginning, and indeed up to the end of the nineteenth century, the Government suffered heavy losses. But on the expiry of the early contracts, more favourable conditions were imposed on Companies, and in some cases the Government themselves constructed and managed the railway lines. Gradually the railway became a source of revenue. The importance of the railway should not, however, be judged merely by the profits it earned. Its importance lay in the facility of communications and the impetus given to trade and industry. By bringing the distant places of this vast country within easy reach, it has served to foster a spirit of unity and nationality among the Indians.

E. Forests

The forests of India have always proved a valuable source of revenue. But the development of a science of forestry, especially in Germany and France, showed the great influence which forests on a large scale exercise over climate, and laid down the lines on which a forest should be maintained and developed to yield the maximum benefit to the country. The appointment, in 1864, of a German expert as Inspector-General of Forests in India ushered in the new scientific method in the management of Indian forests. An Act was passed in 1865 for the protection and efficient management of the Government forests, and it was followed by several other Acts in later years. In 1878 a training school was established at Dehra Dun. The Forest Department controlled an area of 500,000 square miles, and India enjoyed the benefit of a scientific system of forestry.

F. Irrigation

In an agricultural country like India, irrigation has always formed an important branch of administration. Remarkable irrigation projects were

undertaken by both Hindu and Muslim rulers, and the early British rulers also followed in their footsteps. But a new policy was inaugurated by Lord Lawrence in 1866. He financed by public loans extensive irrigation schemes. The results of this new policy were the Sirhind Canal (1882), the Lower Ganges Canal (1878) and Āgra Canal (1874). The first had a total length of 3,700 miles, including the feeder canals.

The "Colony canals" of the Punjab formed a class by themselves. They were intended to reclaim vast areas of waste land which belonged to the Government. The Lower Chenāb Canal constructed between 1890 and 1899, had a total length of 2,700 miles, and irrigates an area of more than two million acres between the Chenāb and Rāvī Rivers. This region, originally lying waste with no population, supported 800,000 in 1901. The canal yielded an annual revenue amounting to 40 per cent of the capital outlay.

Irrigation formed an important branch of every provincial administration, and various projects, both large and small, were being initiated with a view to irrigating the cultivated area and extending cultivation over waste lands.

5. Military Administration

Up to the Revolt, and even for a long time after that, the Presidencies of Bengal, Bombay, and Madras maintained separate armies under separate Commanders. Although the Commander-in-Chief of the Bengal army became nominally the head of the military forces of India, the Governments of Bombay and Madras managed their own forces, and mainly recruited them locally. By an Act which was passed in 1893 and came into operation in 1895, the whole Army in India was placed under the single control of the Commander-in-Chief, and divided into four territorial units—those of Bengal, Madras, Bombay and the Punjab—each under a Lieutenant-General. In 1904 Lord Kitchener made a new organisation on different principles. The Indian military forces were organised into three army commands and nine divisions. The advantages of this system lay in the fact that it co-ordinated the organisation in time of peace with what would be necessary in time of war. In other words, the same generals would be in charge of the same units of the army both in peace and war.

Each Presidency army orginally consisted of three elements, viz. (1) Indian troops, mostly locally recruited, (2) European units belonging to the Company and (3) Royal regiments. After 1858 the last two had of course to be amalgamated, but this provoked great discontent amongst the Company's troops and about 10,000 men claimed their discharge. This is known as the 'White Mutiny". The discontent was, however, allayed by the offer of a bounty and other concessions. As a result of the Revolt of 1857–59, several changes were introduced in the organisation of the army. First,

the proportion of European troops was raised and that of Indian troops was reduced. In 1863 there were 65,000 European troops as against 140,000 Indians, and practically the same ratio was maintained till the outbreak of the First World War. The artillery was exclusively controlled by European troops.

Secondly, there was a great change in the composition of Indian troops, especially those of Northern India. Formerly, these Sepoys were recruited from the same region and belonged almost exclusively to the higher castes. The Revolt showed the defects of this system. Henceforth recruitment was made on a mixed basis so that every company included men of all races, castes and creeds, and could not easily unite and rise into mutiny.

A third change made itself felt only very gradually. It was the introduction of larger elements of fighting races like the Gurkhās, Pathāns, and Sikhs. In course of time they replaced to a large extent the Hindustāni forces of the Bengal army and the locally recruited Sepoys in Bombay and Madras. The most drastic changes were in the Madras army, which was gradually filled by Sikhs, Gurkhās and other Northerners, and ultimately the recruitment of Telugus ceased altogether.

From 1861 an army officer was appointed as a Military Member of the Governor-General's Executive Council, through whom the Government supervised the administration of the Indian army. The position was rendered very anomalous by the fact that the Commander-in-Chief was also an extraordinary member of the Executive Council of the Governor-General. Although he was necessarily superior in rank to the Military Member, any proposal presented by him had to be submitted to the latter for review and criticism. There might have been some justification for this curious anomaly when each Presidency maintained a separate army, but when all the Indian forces were brought under the single control of the Commander-in-Chief in 1895, the anomaly called for redress. Lord Kitchener took up this question in 1904 and proposed to remove the anomaly by making the Commander-in-Chief the sole adviser of the Government on military matters. Lord Curzon, the Viceroy, strongly opposed this system, as he feared that it would remove to a large extent the ultimate control of the civil over the military authorities, and thereby affect the fundamental principles of the constitution. The Secretary of State, however, agreed with Lord Kitchener, and his decision was conveyed in such terms that Lord Curzon tendered his resignation in 1905. After 1907 the Commander-in-Chief became the only responsible authority, under the Government of India, for military administration.

6. Civil Administration

A very important change, with far-reaching consequences, took place in civil administration in 1905. Until then Bengal, Bihār and Orissa had

formed one province ruled by a Lieutenant-Governor. Lord Curzon thought that this territory, comprising 189,000 square miles, was too large a unit for efficient administration and decided to rearrange the provincial boundaries. It was utlimately decided to separate the divisions of Dacca, Chittāgong and Rajshahi from the province. These were joined to Assam, which was then under a Chief Commissioner, and a new province was constituted, called East Bengal and Assam, with Dacca as its capital. The proposal was carried into effect in 1905 in spite of strong protests from the public, and this Partition of Bengal caused a tremendous political agitation which stirred national feeling in India to its very depths, as will be described in a later chapter.

CHAPTER IV

THE GROWTH OF NEW INDIA, 1858–1905

1. Education

THE Despatch of 1854 continued to be the basis of educational policy for India even after it was transferred to the Crown, and was confirmed by the Secretary of State in 1859. The importance of primary education was particularly emphasised and the Secretary of State suggested the levy of a special rate on land to provide adequate means for its promotion. The result was a rapid growth in the number of schools and colleges. Some of these were entirely financed by the Government, while others were managed by private bodies with or without a Government grant-in-aid.

In 1882 a Commission was appointed under the chairmanship of Sir William Hunter to review the progress of education under the new policy, and its report was approved by the Government in 1884. The policy of 1854 was fully endorsed, but emphasis was laid upon the fact that primary education had not made sufficient progress. The report drew attention to the special and urgent need for the extension and improvement of the elementary education of the masses, and recommended that the primary schools should be managed by the newly established Municipal and District Boards under the supervision and control of the Government.

The Committee observed that the system of grants-in-aid had proved very satisfactory and recommended the "progressive devolution of primary, secondary and collegiate education upon private enterprise and continuous withdrawal of Government from competition therewith". The result was a steady increase in the number of schools and colleges.

2. Social and Religious Reform

The second half of the nineteenth century was marked by a strong wave of reforming activities in religion and society, the path of which had been paved by Rājā Rāmmohan Roy. There was a general recognition of the existing evils and abuses in society and religion. But, as usual, the reforming zeal followed diverse channels. Some were lured by the Western ideas to follow an extreme radical policy, and this naturally provoked a reaction

which sought to strengthen the forces of orthodoxy. Between these two extremes were moderate reformers, who wanted to proceed forward more cautiously along the line of least resistance.

We are even now too close to the period to appraise correctly the value of the different forces that were at work and of the consequences that flowed from them. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves merely to a review of the chief movements. It would be convenient to study them under two heads. First, the movements resulting in the establishment of a group or order outside the pale of orthodox Hindu society, and secondly general changes in the belief, customs and practices of the Hindus as a whole.

A. The Brāhma Samāj

Under the first head, the Brāhma Samāj demands our chief attention as it is the most striking product of a strong reform movement brought about by the impact of new ideas and beliefs that agitated men's minds early in the nineteenth century.

Reference has already been made to a theistic organisation founded by Rājā Rāmmohan Roy in 1828. It was called Brāhma Sabhā and meant to be an assembly of all who believed in the unity of God and discarded the worship of images. A house was built and handed over to a body of Trustees. The Trust Deed which the Rājā executed on 8th January, 1830, directed that the building was to be used "as and for a place of public meeting of all sorts of descriptions of people, without distinction", for the worship of the one Great God, but that no image should be admitted or rituals permitted therein.

This arrangement for the non-sectarian worship of the one True God is looked upon nowadays as the foundation of the Brāhma Samāj. It must be remembered, however, that Rāmmohan Roy never regarded himself as anything but a Hindu, and stoutly denied, up to the last day of his life, the allegation that he was founding a different sect. The detailed programme of his weekly service in what was then called Brāhma Sabhā (also Brāhma Samāj) included the recitation of the Vedas by orthodox Brāhmaṇas and no non-Brāhmaṇa was allowed in the room. The Rājā himself wore the sacred thread of the Brāhmaṇas up to his death.

The departure of Rājā Rāmmohan Roy for England and his subsequent death there led to a steady decline of his organisation till new life was infused into it by Devendranāth Tagore (father of Rabindranāth), who established a cultural organisation called the Tattvabodhinī Sabhā in 1839 and formally joined the new movement in 1843. He framed a covenant and introduced a formal ceremony of initiation, thus converting the somewhat loose organisation into a spiritual fraternity. Devandranāth began to propagate the new doctrine through his journal, *Tattvabodhinī Patrikā*, and also by the employ-

ment of a number of preachers. It must be noted that the mode of initiation into the new faith was based on the *Māhanirvāṇa Tantra*, and the *Tattvabodhinī Patrikā*, the official organ, openly declared the Vedas as a divine revelation and the sole foundation of the religious beliefs of the new Church.

But the younger section among the followers of the new movement, led by Akshaykumār Datta, gradually showed a critical attitude towards the doctrine of the infallibility of the Vedas, and Devendranāth sympathized with them. He made a compilation of select passages from the Upanishads inculcating the idea of one God, and framed a new covenant for the Church embodying the principles of natural and universal theism in the place of the old Vedantic covenant (1850).

Encouraged by this success the younger section not only advocated far-reaching social reforms, but also wanted to apply the dry test of reason even to the fundamental articles of religious belief. This party gained a notable recruit in Keshab Chandra Sen, who joined the new movement in 1857. Keshab Chandra's fervent devotion, passionate enthusiasm and wonderful eloquence popularised the movement and increased its members. At the same time he carried its rationalistic principles to a still further degree, and founded what may be called the new Brāhmaism. He infused the true spirit of repentance and prayer and introduced an element of strong emotion and devotional fervour into the cause of the new Church. A new missionary zeal characterised the followers of Keshab, some of whom gave up their secular affairs and devoted their whole time to the preaching of the new gospel all over Bengal. Keshab himself visited Bombay and Madras to propagate his views.

The results of these activities were very remarkable. Before the end of 1865 there were fifty-four Samājas (local branches), fifty in Bengal, two in the N.W.P. and one each in the Punjab and Madras.

At first Devendranāth warmly appreciated the services of Keshab Chandra and appointed him the minister of the Church and Secretary of the Samāj in defiance of the wishes of many older members. But the progressive ideas of Keshab and his party soon estranged them from the revered leader. They advocated and openly celebrated inter-caste marriage and widow-remarriage, and insisted that Brāhmaṇa ministers, wearing sacred threads, should not be allowed to preach from the pulpits. Instead of allowing the Samāj to be drawn away from the old Hindu lines laid down by Rājā Rāmmohan Roy, Devendranāth, by virtue of his position as the sole trustee of the Samāj, dismissed Keshab and his followers from all offices and positions of trust and responsibility. Keshab took up the challenge and started a separate organisation which included most of the local branches. Thus by the year 1865 the Brāhma Samāj was divided into two camps, the conservatives and the progressives. The former included men who believed in one God and discarded the worship of images, but did not want to sever all connection with Hindu society, while the latter consisted of those who regarded popular

Hinduism as too narrow and chafed at the use of Sanskrit texts and the performance of social practices which symbolised that religion.

After the great schism, the Ādi Brāhma Samāj, the organisation of Devendranāth, quietly followed the pure monotheistic form of Hinduism, setting its face deliberately against social reform or propaganda of any kind. But it soon passed into obscurity. The period of reformation ushered in by Rājā Rāmmohan Roy was over and a revolution was now in progress.

The newly started "Brāhma Samāj of India" had a triumphant career under the guidance of Keshab Chandra Sen. The missionary exertions all over Bengal and even far outside its boundaries led to an increase in the number of local churches. The inclusion of women as members and the adoption of a moderate programme of social reform formed a new feature of the rejuvenated society. It was chiefly due to its efforts that the Government passed the Act III of 1872, which abolished early marriage of girls and polygamy, and sanctioned widow marriages and inter-caste marriages for those who did not profess any recognised faith such as Hinduism and Islam. Another striking feature was the adoption of the *Saṁkīrtan* in the Vaishṇava style for the purpose of propaganda. At first "Jesus was the inspirer and teacher of Keshab and now came Chaitanya. The two streams combined and made a confluence which soon produced novel and striking results." The passion of *Bhakti* (devotion) seized the members, and in true Vaishṇava style many of them prostrated themselves at each other's feet and especially at the feet of Keshab. Reverence for the leader grew apace and he gradually came to be regarded by some as a prophet or a divine incarnation.

This practice of "man-worship" led to a fresh discord in the Brāhma Church. Progressives and rationalists strongly protested against certain innovations and demanded that a definite constitution should be framed for the management of the churches. Soon other points arose to widen the gulf between the two sections. Keshab held moderate views about female education and female emancipation, and he was not prepared to go to the extreme lengths proposed by the more advanced section. In his opinion higher University education would not be suitable for women, and free mingling of men and women, or the total abolition of the *Purdah* system, was fraught with grave danger to society. The advanced or progressive section was strongly agitated over these important points of difference with the great leader when the marriage of Keshab's fourteen-year-old daughter with the Hindu Maharājā of Cooch Bihār in March, 1878, led to the second schism in the Brāhma Church.

Those who differed seceded and on 15th May, 1878, formed a different organisation called the *Sādhāran Brāhma Samāj*. Subsequent events showed the great strength of this party. Keshab's Church shared the same fate as that of Devendranāth and passed into comparative obscurity. The spirit of the Brāhma movement has now been focused mainly in the *Sādhāran Brāhma*

Samāj to which almost all the provincial *Samājas* are affiliated.

The new *Samāj* has consistently followed the path of constitutionalism and upheld an advanced programme of social reform. In respect of the position of women in society it has attained results of far-reaching importance by the removal of the *Purdah* system, introduction of widow-remarriage, abolition of polygamy and early marriage, and provision of higher education, and it is interesting to note that Hindu society has largely adopted these ideas. In the removal of caste-rigidity it has presented Hindu society with another reform which it is gradually accepting. The fact that legislation has been passed validating widow-remarriage and inter-caste marriages among the Hindus shows the great repercussion of the Brāhma movement upon Hindu society. Many far-reaching changes in Hindu social ideas have been and are still being brought about, steadily and silently, by the indirect influence of the Brāhma Samāj. Interdining among different castes at public and sometimes even social functions, and travel to foreign lands beyond the sea without loss of caste, may be quoted as examples. Curiously enough, the only point where it has failed to influence Hindu society, to any appreciable degree, is its emphasis on monotheism and the abolition of the worship of images, the first and fundamental idea with which the new movement started.

B. The Prārthanā Samāj

As has already been noted above, the Brāhma Samāj movement gradually spread outside Bengal, but nowhere did it take deep root except in Mahārāshtra, where it led to the establishment of the *Prārthanā Samāj*. Like the Brāhma Samāj, rational worship of one God and social reform formed its ideals. It has been truly remarked, however, that differences between the emotional character of the Bengalis and the practical shrewd common sense of the Marāthas are clearly reflected in the two institutions which sprang up under similar conditions.

The Brāhma Samāj made its influence felt in Māhārashtra as early as 1849 with the foundation of Paramahansa Sabhā. But this did not live long or count for much. It was in 1867 that, under the enthusiastic guidance of Keshab Chandra Sen, the Prārthanā Samāj came into existence. The difference in name was evidently deliberate, for unlike the followers of Brāhma Samāj in Bengal, the followers of Prārthanā Samāj never "looked upon themselves as adherents of a new religion or of a new sect, outside and alongside of the general Hindu body, but simply as a movement within it". They were devoted theists, followers of the great religious tradition of Marātha saints like Nāmdev, Tukārām and Rāmdās. But instead of religious speculation they devoted their chief attention to social reform such as interdining and intermarriage among different castes, remarriage of widows and

improvement of the lot of women and depressed classes. They established a Foundling Asylum and Orphanage at Pandharpur and founded night schools, a Widows' Home, a Depressed Classes Mission and other useful institutions of this kind. The Prārthanā Samāj has been the centre of many activities for social reform in Western India. Its success is chiefly due to Justice Mahadev Govinda Ranade. As C.F. Andrews observed, " the last and in many ways the most enduring aspect of the new reformation in India has had its rise in the Bombay Presidency and is linked most closely with the name of Justice Ranade ". He devoted his whole life to the furtherance of the objects of the Prārthanā Samāj. He was one of the founders of the Widow Marriage Association in 1861, and the famous Deccan Education Society (1884–1885) owes its origin to his inspiration. He inaugurated the practice of holding a Social Conference along with the annual meeting of the Indian National Congress.

To Justice Ranade we owe the clear elucidation of two important principles. First he emphasised the truth that " the reformer must attempt to deal with the whole man and not to carry out reform on one side only ". " To Ranade religion was as inseparable from social reform as love to man is inseparable from love to God." His ideas of reform were thus very comprehensive. " You cannot," said he, " have a good social system when you find yourself low in the scale of political rights; nor can you be fit to exercise political rights unless your social system is based on reason and justice. You cannot have a good economical system, when your social arrangements are imperfect. If your religious ideas are low and grovelling you cannot succeed in social, economical and political spheres. This interdependence is not an accident but it is the law of our nature."

The second great principle which Ranade emphasised was that the social organism in India shows a growth which should not be ignored and cannot be forcibly suppressed. " There are those among us," said he, " who think that the work of the reformer is confined only to a brave resolve to break with the past, and do what his own individual reason suggests as proper and fitting. The power of long-formed habits and tendencies is ignored in this view of the matter." Ranade showed a truer grasp of things when he ventured to state: " The true reformer has not to write on a clean slate. His work is more often to complete the half-written sentence."

Ranade's great message was a severe but timely warning to the excessive zeal of certain Indian reformers, and has helped a great deal in giving a new orientation to Indian reforms. This brief sketch of Ranade may be concluded with the eulogy of C. F. Andrews: " Ranade comes nearest to Rājā Rāmmohan Roy and Sir Syed Ahmad Khān among the reformers already mentioned in the largeness of his range of vision and the magnanimity of his character; but he was more advanced than either of them in the width of his constructive aim, his grasp of the principles underlying Western civilisation, and his application of them to Indian conditions."

The Brāhma Samāj and the Prārthanā Samāj were largely products of ideas associted with the West, and represent the Indian response to Western rationalism. Far different in character were two other reforming movements which took their inspiration from India's past and derived their basic principles from her ancient scriptures.

C. The Ārya Samāj

The first in order of time is the Ārya Samāj, founded by Svāmī Dayānanda Saraswati (1824–1883). He was a good Sanskrit scholar but had no English education. His motto was " Go back to the Vedas ". He wanted to shape society on the model of the Vedas by removing all later outgrowths. He not only disregarded the authority of the later scriptures like the Purāṇas, but had no hesitation in declaring them to be the writings of selfish, ignorant men. His basic standpoint was, therefore, exactly that of Rājā Rāmmohan Roy, and the detailed views of both were, to a great extent, similar. Like the Rājā, Dayānanda believed in one God and decried polytheism and the use of images; he also raised his voice against the restrictions of caste, child-marriage and prohibition of sea-voyage; and encouraged female education and remarriage of widows. He began the *Suddhi* movement, i.e. conversion of non-Hindus to Hinduism—which has since become such an important feature of the Hindu reform movement. The *Suddhi* movement was undoubtedly meant " to realise the ideal of unifying India nationally, socially and religiously ". Like Rājā Rāmmohan, Dayānanda published his views through printed books, his most famous work being *Satyārtha Prakāś*, " which expounded his doctrine and formulated it as a doctrine *sui generis* ". Unlike Rājā Rāmmohan, however, Dayānanda preached directly to the masses, and did not confine his teachings to an intellectual élite. As a result, his followers rapidly increased in number, and his teachings took deep root, especially in the Punjab and the United Provinces.

Although Dayānanda started from the same basic principle as Rājā Rammohan, he lacked the critical spirit of the latter. He claimed that " any scientific theory or principle which is thought to be of modern origin may be proved to be set forth in the Vedas ". On an ultimate analysis his general principle amounts to this, that " the Vedas, as interpreted by Dayānanda, contain all the truth ". The interpretation of Dayānanda, however, differs widely from the traditional Hindu as well as the modern Western exegesis. In spite of his obvious limitations, Dayānanda undoubtedly proved a dynamic force in Hindu society. His appeal to the masses, which was attended with splendid success, was an eye-opener to all reformers, social, religious and political, and the social and educational work done by him and his followers has achieved solid results. His work was continued after his death by his followers, chief among whom were Lālā Hansrāj, Pandit Guru Dutt, Lālā Lajpat Rāi, and Svāmi Śraddhānanda.

The Ārya Samāj did not, however, escape the rationalism of the present age. Already there was a growing section among it which recognised the value of English education and was inclined to a more liberal programme. Its chief exponent was Lālā Hansrāj and its visible symbol the Dayānanda Anglo-Vedic College of Lahore. As a countermove to this we may point to the famous Gurukul of Hardwār, founded in 1902, which seeks to revive the Vedic ideal in modern life.

It may be noted, in conclusion, that Dayānanda, at the beginning of his career, tried to come to terms with the Brāhma Samāj and a Conference was held in Calcutta in 1869 with that end in view. Nothing, however, came of it, and the Ārya Samāj ultimately overwhelmed and absorbed the Brāhma Samāj movement in the Punjab, where, in Lahore, a Brāhma Samāj had already been started in 1863.

D. The Rāmakrishna Mission

The synthesis of the two great forces, the ancient or Oriental and the modern or Western, marks the Rāmakrishna Mission, the last great religious and social movement which characterises the nineteenth century. Rāmakrishna Paramahansa (1836–1886), after whom the Mission is named, was a poor priest in a temple at Dakhinesvar near Calcutta. He had scarcely any formal education, Eastern or Western, worth the name, but led an intense spiritual life in his splendid isolation. He had a deep faith in the inherent truth of all religions and tested his belief by performing religious exercises in accordance with the practice and usages not only of different Hindu sects, but also of Islam and Christianity. His broad catholicity, mysticism, and spiritual fervour attracted a small number of occasional visitors, mostly from Calcutta. He lived and died as a secluded spiritual devotee, unknown except to a comparatively small group of people. To them he expounded his views in short pithy sayings and admirable parables. Most of these were collected and published before his death, and many other works about him and his sayings have been published since then.

The most famous among his disciples, and the one most beloved of the *guru*, was a young graduate of the Calcutta University named Narendranāth Dutta, afterwards famous as Svāmī Vivekānanda (1863–1902). It was he who carried the message of Rāmakrishna all over India. His learning, eloquence, spiritual fervour and wonderful personality gathered round him a band of followers which included both prince and peasant. With their help, and after untold sufferings, he attended in 1893 the famous "Parliament of Religions" at Chicago, and at once made his mark. His speeches at that august assembly and other places in U.S.A. and U. K. brought him fame and friends, and from that day the teachings of Rāmakrishna, as interpreted by Svāmī Vivekānanda, came to be recognised as a world-

force. Rāmakrishna missions and monasteries came to be established in different centres in the United States, and after the return of the triumphant hero to his country they spread all over India.

The Rāmakrishna Mission stands for religious and social reform but takes its inspiration from the ancient culture of India. It holds up the pure Vedantic doctrine as its ideal, and aims at the development of the highest spirituality inherent in man; but at the same time it recognises the value and utility of later developments in Hinduism such as the worship of images, and the modern developments in natural sciences and technology. Rāmakrishna demonstrated in his own life not only the compatibility of the worship of the goddess Kali with the highest spiritual life, but even something more than that, viz. that the worship of images may be utilised as an excellent means of developing the highest spiritual fervour in man. But he laid his finger on the real source of abuse in present-day Hinduism, viz. mistaking the external rituals for the essential spirit, the symbol for the real.

Another characteristic feature of the Mission, also practically demonstrated by Rāmakrishna, is a belief in the truth of all religions. "All the different religious views are but different ways leading to the same goal," was the characteristic expression of the Great Master. As different words in different languages denote the same substance, e.g. "water", so Allah, Hari, Christ, Kṛishṇa, etc., are but different names under which we worship the same great God. He is both one and many, with and without forms, and may be conceived either as a great universal spirit or through different symbols. This catholic and broad view is in striking contrast to the sectarian views which are dividing the modern world into so many hostile camps and making religion a symbol for hate and discord instead of love and brotherhood.

In addition to these two characteristic features, the success of the Mission in and outside India is due to several other causes. In the first place it has no aggressive proselytising zeal. It has no desire to develop into a separate sect like the Brāhma or the Ārya Samāj and chooses to remain as a purely monastic order, disseminating reforming ideas among the masses without violently uprooting them from their social or religious environments. Secondly, it has put in the forefront of its programme the idea of social service, not as a mere philanthropic work, but as an essential discipline for religious and spiritual life. The Mission has opened many schools and dispensaries, and has always rendered ungrudging help to the people in times of distress caused by famine or flood or other calamity. In particular, the uplift of the dumb millions of India forms the chief plank of the Mission's platform. In Svāmī Vivekānanda the patriotic and spiritual impulses mingled in a supreme desire to uplift the manhood of India with a view to restoring her to her proper place among the nations of the world. He believed that the present warring world can be saved by spiritual teachings which India alone can impart, but before she can do this she must enjoy the respect of other

nations by raising her own status. The Svāmī had thus both a national and universal outlook and this explains his popularity in India and America.

In addition, the Hindus of India have special reasons for venerating Svāmī Vivekānanda. For the first time in the modern age he boldly proclaimed before the world the superiority of Hindu culture and civilisation, the greatness of her past and the hope for her future. Instead of the tone of apology and a sense of inferiority which marked the Indian attitude towards European culture and civilisation, a refreshing boldness and consciousness of inherent strength marked the utterances of Svāmi Vivekānanda. This, combined with his patriotic zeal, made him an embodiment of the highest ideas of the renascent Indian nation. He was, to quote the words of Sir Valentine Chirol, "the first Hindu whose personality won demonstrative recognition abroad for India's ancient civilisation and for her new-born claim to nationhood".

E. The Theosophical Society

The Theosophical Society was founded by the " mysterious " Madame H.P. Blavatsky and Col. H.S. Olcott in the United States in 1875. They came to India in 1879 and in 1886 established their headquarters in Adyar, a suburb of Madras. The real success of the movement in India is, however, due to Mrs. Annie Besant, who joined the Society in 1889 and settled in India in 1893 at the age of forty-six.

The Theosophical Society from the very start allied itself to the Hindu revival movement. Mrs. Besant held that the present problems of India could be solved by the revival and reintroduction of her ancient ideals and institutions. In her autobiography (1893) she writes: " The Indian work is, first of all, the revival, strengthening, and uplifting of the ancient religions. This has brought with it a new self-respect, a pride in the past, a belief in the future, and, as an inevitable result, a great wave of patriotic life, the beginning of the rebuilding of a nation."

She started the Central Hindu School in Benares as a chief means of achieving her object. She lavished her resources and energy on this institution, which gradually developed into a College and was ultimately merged into the Hindu University.

The Theosophical Society, with its many branches all over India, has proved an important factor in social and religious reform especially in South India. But in its attempt to revert to the old, it supports some usages and beliefs which are considered by many to be retrograde in character, and its occult mysticism has alienated many who might have been its followers. Most of its importance in Indian life was due more to the personality of Mrs. Besant than to any inherent strength of the movement.

The general movements described above led to a great upheaval in Hindu

society and stimulated the growth of individual and organised efforts for social reform. It is not possible to give a detailed account of them all in this chapter, and we shall therefore refer briefly to some of the more important among them, which might serve as representative types of this kind of activity in modern India, here and in a subsequent chapter. The Deccan Education Society was founded under Ranade's inspiration in 1884. It started with the idea that the education of the young should be remodelled so as to fit them for the service of the country, a task which the existing system of education had failed to perform. The members of the Society undertook to serve for at least twenty years on a nominal salary (Rs. 75 to start with), and thus it was possible without large endowments or donations to start the famous Fergusson College in Poona, and the Willingdon College at Sangli, with a number of preparatory schools to feed them. The "life-workers of the Society included the famous Gopal Krishna Gokhalē" (1866–1915).

The names of Pandit Iswar Chandra Vidyāsāgar and Malabari stand foremost in connection with the uplifting of Indian women. Their hearts were touched by the miseries of women, and they carried on a life-long campaign, to better their lot. As a result of unremitting labour and strenuous agitation Vidyāsāgar succeeded in inducing the Government to pass a measure in 1856 legalising the remarriage of Hindu widows. Similarly Malabari's efforts led to the Age of Consent Act, 1891.

3. National Awakening—Indian National Congress

The most important phenomenon in New India is the growth of a national consciousness which ultimately found active expression in the formation of the Indian National Congress, the Muslim League, and other bodies of the kind. Various factors contributed to the development of this national awakening, which was based upon two fundamental principles, viz. the unity of India as a whole and the right of her people to rule themselves.

As with all great national movements, e.g. the French Revolution, there was an intellectual background to this political regeneration. In a previous chapter we have traced the growth of English education in India. It is a matter of common knowledge that a tremendous wave of liberalism was passing over English politics and literature during the nineteenth century. By the study of English literature and European history educated Indians imbibed the spirit of democracy and national patriotism which England unequivocally declared to be her political ideals. Further, the promotion of these sentiments was deliberately encouraged by the liberal statesmanship which England at first displayed in her policy towards India and other dominions.

From the very beginning the British Government publicly declared its liberal policy towards India. The Charter Act of 1813 definitely laid it down

that " it is the duty of this country to promote the interest and happiness of the native inhabitants of the British dominions in India". This was not only corroborated but even further elucidated by the Parliamentary Committee of 1833 when it laid down "the indisputable principle that the interests of the native subjects are to be consulted in preference to those of Europeans whenever the two come in competition". Finally came the Queen's Proclamation of 1858 in which she declared that "We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects".

The pronouncement of Queen Victoria acquired a special significance for Indians in view of the democratic constitution granted to Canadian subjects during her reign, followed by similar measures of self-government conceded to other colonies in subsequent times.

All these causes created new aspirations in the minds of educated Indians. They had great faith in the liberal statesmen of Britain and their sense of justice and fair play. They thought that as soon as the Indians could make up a good case and present it well, nothing would be wanting on the part of British liberals to meet their reasonable demands.

The first concrete demand was naturally one for a larger admission of Indians to the higher ranks of the Civil Service. The Civil Service was the "steel-frame" of British administration, and Macaulay did not very much exaggerate the fact when he said in the House of Commons that "even the character of the Governor General was less important than the character and spirit of the servants by whom the administration of India was carried on". It was obvious to educated Indians that the first step to secure a real and legitimate share in the management of the administration was to get into the higher ranks of the Civil Service in steadily increasing numbers.

A definite pledge was given by the Charter Act of 1833 that no Indian " shall by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, colour or any of them be disabled from holding any office or employment under the Company". This was reiterated in the Queen's Proclamation of 1858 and the Indian Civil Service Act of 1861. In spite of these promises there was plainly visible a growing reluctance on the part of the British Government to admit Indians in large numbers to the Civil Service. The failure to fulfil the pledges so repeatedly given is admitted by British statesmen themselves. " Lord Houghton observed that the declaration which stated that the Government of India would be conducted without reference to differences of race, was magnificent but had hitherto been futile." That the Government did not choose to carry out this policy is admitted by no less an authority than Lord Lytton (I), the Governor-General. In a confidential despath on this subject, he stated that " all means were taken of breaking to the heart the words of promise they had uttered to the ear".

It is easy to imagine the feelings of English-educated Indians, who had pinned their faith on the liberalism and the sense of justice of English states-

men. There was profound disappointment and a rude disillusionment, followed by feelings of bitter resentment. Soon incidents occurred which changed the passive discontent into an active agitation.

These incidents were connected with the appointment of Mr. Surendranāth Banerjea to the I.C.S. Although he proved successful in the competitive examination, attempts were made to remove his name from the list. Ultimately the name was restored by a writ of *Mandamus* in the Queen's Bench, and Mr. Banerjea was appointed to the I.C.S., but he was soon dismissed from the Service on grounds which are now regarded as inadequate.

The man who was thus denied an opportunity to serve the British Government was destined to be the leader of the great national movement in India. He took to public life and on 26th July, 1876, founded the Indian Association of Calcutta, which, to use the language of its founder, " was to be the centre of an All-India movement" based on "the conception of a united India, derived from the inspiration of Mazzini". It was an organisation of the educated middle class with a view to creating public opinion by direct appeals to the people. Mr. Banerjea's great opportunity came when in 1877 the maximum age-limit for the Civil Service Examination was reduced from twenty-one to nineteen. This created a painful impression throughout India, and was regarded as a deliberate attempt to blast the prospects of Indian candidates for the Indian Civil Service. The Indian Association organised a national protest against the reactionary measure. A big public meeting was held in Calcutta and Mr. Banerjea led a whirlwind campaign, holding similar meetings at Āgra, Lahore, Amritsar, Meerut, Allahābād, Delhi, Cawnpore, Lucknow, 'Ālīgarh and Benares. The nature and object of these meetings is thus described by Mr. Banerjea: " The agitation was the means; the raising of the maximum limit of age for the open competitive examination and the holding of simultaneous examinations were among the ends; but the underlying conception, and the true aim and purpose of the Civil Service Agitation, was the awakening of a spirit of unity and solidarity among the people of India."

The tour of Mr. Banerjea was a great success. Sir Henry Cotton wrote about it as follows in his book *New India:* " The idea of any Bengalee influence in the Punjab would have been a conception incredible to Lord Lawerence...yet it is the case that during the past year the tour of a Bengalee lecturer lecturing in English in Upper India, assumed the character of a triumphal progress; and at the present moment the name of Surendranāth Banerjea excites as much enthusiasm among the rising generation of Multan as in Dacca."

The results of the national movement organised by the Indian Association with the help of Mr. Banerjea were indeed very great. To use the words of Mr. Banerjea: " For the first time under British rule, India, with its varied races and religions, had been brought upon the same platform for a common and united effort. Thus was it demonstrated, by an object-lesson of

impressive significance, that, whatever might be our differences in respect of race and language, or social and religious institutions, the people of India could combine and unite for the attainment of their common political ends".

The Civil Service agitation thus taught important lessons which ultimately found expression in the Indian Congress. It also opened up another line along which progress might be made towards the political regeneration of the country. A memorial on the Civil Service question was adopted at the Calcutta meeting and endorsed at the other public meetings. It contained a prayer to the House of Commons not to lower the limit of age for the open competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service and to hold simultaneous examinations in India and England. Instead of adopting the usual course of sending the memorial by post, Mr. Lālmohan Ghosh, a well-known Bengali barrister in Calcutta, was sent to England to present it in person as the representative of the Indian Association. Mr. Ghosh was an eloquent speaker and made a deep impression upon the British audience about the pressing grievance of India. Mr. S. N. Banerjea thus describes his campaign: "A great meeting was held under the Presidency of John Bright. Mr. Ghosh spoke with a power and eloquence that excited the admiration of all and evoked the warmest tribute from the President. The effect of that meeting was instantaneous. Within twenty-four hours of it, there were laid on the table of the House of Commons the Rules creating what was subsequently known as the Statutory Civil Service....Thus the deputation of an Indian to England voicing India's grievance was attended with an unexpected measure of success and the experiment was in future years tried again and again."

The Civil Service agitation was soon followed up by similar agitations against the Arms Act and the Vernacular Press Act of Lord Lytton, which sought to limit the possession of arms and control the Vernacular Press. All three measures were regarded as part of a policy to hamper the growth of a National India, and show the reactionary character of the regime of Lord Salisbury as Secretary of State for India. History teaches us that "reactionary rulers are often the creators of great public movements". So it proved in India. The agitation against these unpopular measures shaped the political life of India and made it conscious of its strength and potentialities. Soon it ceased to be a mere question of repealing these obnoxious measures. There was a steady development of natioal aspirations, and a higher ideal dazzled the vision of political India. It was not thought enough that Indians should have their full share of the higher offices. They must eventually bring the entire administration under popular control and therefore make a definite demand for representative institutions.

The new ideal called for an All-India organisation of a permanent character. This was considerably facilitated by the controversy over the Ilbert Bill. The Bill introduced in 1883 by Ilbert, the Law Member of the Viceroy's Council, sought to withdraw the privilege, hitherto enjoyed by European British subjects in the districts, of trial by a judge of their own race.

The Anglo-Indian community carried on an agitation against this measure both in India and England. They started a Defence Association with branches all over India, and raised over a lakh and fifty thousand rupees. It provoked a counter-agitation by educated Indians. The Government ultimately withdrew the Bill and substituted for it a more moderate measure which vested the power of trying Europeans in Sessions Judges and District Magistrates who might be Indians. The success of the anti-Ilbert Bill agitation "left a rankling sense of humiliation in the mind of educated India", but it also demonstrated the value of combination and organisation. The lesson was not lost upon educated India. As before, Surendranāth took the lead and within a year an All-India National Fund was created and the Indian National Conference, with representatives from all parts of India, met in Calcutta (1883).

During the same year a retired civilian, Allan Octavian Hume, addressed an open letter to the graduates of Calcutta University urging them to organise an association for the mental, moral, social, and political regeneration of the people of India. He enlisted official favour in support of such an organisation. The Governor-General, Lord Dufferin, told him "that he found the greatest difficulty in ascertaining the real wishes of the people and that it would be a public benefit if there existed some responsible organisation through which the Government might be kept informed regarding the best Indian public opinion".

Mr. Hume, with the support of some prominent Indians, succeeded in giving effect to his plan, and the first Indian National Congress met in Bombay during the Christmas week of 1885 under the Presidency of a Bengal barrister, Mr. W. C. Bonnerjea. About the same time the second session of the Indian National Conference was held in Calcutta. It appears that the two movements were simultaneous and independent, and the organisers of neither knew about the other until on the eve of their sittings. Both the organisations were conceived on the same lines and adopted the same programme, and it was obviously undesirable that there should be two such associations working independently in two different parts of India. It is a striking testimony to the growth of a feeling of national unity that without any difficulty the Indian National Conference silently merged itself into the Indian National Congress. The Madras Mahājan Sabhā and the Bombay Presidency Association came into existence in 1884 and 1885 respectively, and both these organisations tried to focus attention of the people on various problems of administration and public life.

The first Indian National Congress consisted only of seventy delegates, for some prominent leaders, including Surendranāth, could not attend it on account of the simultaneous session of the Indian National Conference. Henceforth the Congress met every year, during Christmas week, in some important town of India, the second and third sessions being held respectively in Calcutta and Madras. Everywhere it evoked great enthusiasm among

the local public, and attracted gradually increasing numbers of delegates from different parts of India. It admirably fulfilled the object which Hume had formulated in the following words in his opening manifesto: " directly, to enable all earnest labourers in the National cause to become personally known to each other, to discuss and decide upon the political operations to be undertaken during the ensuing year; and indirectly, this Conference will form the germ of a Native Parliament, and, if properly conducted, will in a few years constitute an unanswerable reply to the assertion that India is unfit for any form of representative institutions."

Throughout the nineteenth century the Congress chiefly concerned itself with criticism of Government policy and demands for reforms. Its views were formulated in the shape of resolutions which were forwarded to the Government for their consideration.

It drew the attention of the Government to the appalling poverty of the country and asked for proper inquiry and redress. It criticised the Arms Act and various administrative measures, particularly the Excise and Salt tax.

As regards reforms, it laid special emphasis on the following specific measures:

(1) Development of self-government by means of representative councils both in the Central as well as in the Provincial Governments.
(2) Abolition of the Indian Council.
(3) Spread of education, both general and technical.
(4) Reduction of military expenditure, and military training of Indians.
(5) The separation of Judicial and Executive functions in the administration of criminal justice.
(6) Wider employment of Indians in the higher offices in the Public Service, especially by instituting I.C.S. examinations both in England and India.

In criticising Government policy the Congress always maintained great dignity and moderation. It professed unswerving loyalty to the Throne and cherished an unbounded faith in the liberalism and sense of justice of British statesmen. Its whole endeavour was directed towards rousing their consciousness to the inherent justice of the Indian claims.

In the year 1896 an Industrial Exhibition was held in connection with the Congress to give an impetus to Indian industry. A Social Conference was also added in order to call public attention to, and devise means for the removal of, the acknowledged social evils.

At the very beginning the Government looked upon the Congress movement with favour, at least without any dislike. Government officials not only attended the first meeting of the Congress but even took part in its deliberations. Congress members were invited to a garden party by the

Governor-General (Lord Dufferin) in Calcutta (1886), and the Governor in Madras (1887).

But the official world soon changed its view. Lord Dufferin, on the eve of his retirement, expressed his disapproval of the policy and methods of the Indian National Congress at the St. Andrew's Dinner in Calcutta and described the educated community as a "microscopic minority". The high officials took their cue from him, and gradually the Government officers kept aloof from the Congress movement.

The official attitude to the Congress was based on the plea that the educated community as an infinitesimal minority had no right or claim to represent the views of India. The Congress rejoinder to this argument formed the basis on which rested the sole justification of its claim to a representative character. It was ably summed up as follows by Sir Ramesh Chandra Mitra in his speech as Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Congress held in Calcutta in 1896:

"The educated community represented the brain and conscience of the country, and were the legitimate spokesmen of the illiterate masses, the natural custodians of their interests. To hold otherwise would be to presuppose that a foreign administrator in the service of the Government knows more about the wants of the masses than their educated countrymen. It is true in all ages that those who think must govern those who toil; and could it be that the natural order of things was reversed in this unfortunate country?"

It is no wonder that the resolutions of the Congress evoked but little response from the Government. As Hume declared, "the National Congress had endeavoured to instruct the Government, but the Government had refused to be instructed". Disappointed with the Government attitude, the Congress decided to bring pressure upon the Government by organising public opinion both in India and England. The method, popularly known as Constitutional Agitation, henceforth became the chief instrument of the Congress. Apart from organisation of meetings in India, a paid agency was established in London in 1888. It arranged lectures in different parts of England and distributed pamphlets to educate public opinion. Its place was soon taken by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress which published a weekly paper called *India*.

The agitation in England bore fruit. Charles Bradlaugh, M.P., attended the fifth session of the Congress in Bombay in 1889, and in consultation with Indian leaders drafted a Bill for the reform and the expansion of the Legislative Councils. This he moved in the House of Commons in 1890. To counteract it the Government introduced a Bill of their own which was passed in 1892. The India Councils Act of 1892 (p. 845) is thus indirectly an achievement of the Congress.

As regards the other proposals of the Congress, little was done by the Government. Year after year the Congress passed nearly the same resolutions

but without much effect on the Government. This brought about a feeling of despondency, and gradually a spirit of opposition against the Government gained ground. A section of the Congress even began to lose faith in the efficacy of the Congress programme. They ridiculed the idea of sending humble petitions year after year to the Government, only to be most unceremoniously rejected by them. They believed that reforms would not be secured by talk, but action. The leader of this section was Bal Gangādhar Tilak, a Marātha Brāhmana of the class to which belonged the famous Peshwās.

Among the people of different parts of India the Marāthas, who had lost their independence so recently, had special reasons to join a movement for national regeneration. No wonder, therefore, that the Marātha country proved a congenial soil for fostering the new spirit. Tilak tried to create a strong national feeling among the Indians by an appeal to their historic past. He led the opposition against official interference in social matters. He organised annual festivals in commemoration of Shivājī. Through his paper *Kesari*, he preached his new political ideals of self-help and national revival among the masses. The speeches and articles of Tilak are generally held to have been responsible for the growth of a Radical section which soon became a powerful wing of the Congress.

All sections and communities of the Indian population did not at first show an equal enthusiasm for the Congress movement. Some notable Muslim leaders took part in its annual deliberations, and on a few occasions it had a Muslim President. Nevertheless, it is an undeniable fact that a strong section of the Muslims, from the very beginning, adopted an unsympathetic attitude towards the Congress, though Muslims in general were indifferent, rather than hostile to it. Mr. Sayani, who presided over the Congress in 1896, observed with truth: "It is imagined by some persons that all, or almost all, the Muslims of India are against the Congress movement; this is not true. Indeed by far the largest part do not know what the Congress movement is."

There were deep-seated causes for this difference. The Muslims did not show the same zeal and fervour for Western education and culture as the Hindu community led by Rāmmohan Roy, Rājnārāyan Bose, Haris Mukherji, Telang, Ranade, and others. They still showed a preference for the classical studies to which they had so long been accustomed. Their reaction to the British rule was also different. They still brooded over their erstwhile political dominance over the greater part of India, and felt a sullen resentment against the British. They therefore naturally supported, or felt sympathy for, the revolutionary Wahhābi movement and the Revolt of 1857–59. It is interesting to note that even at an early stage the British sought to take advantage of this position by means of the policy of "Divide and Rule". "I cannot," wrote Lord Ellenborough in 1843, "close my eyes to the belief that that race (Muslims) is fundamentally hostile to us, and our true policy is

to reconcile the Hindus." This policy was successfully followed for some time till the growth of national consciousness among the Hindus gradually alienated the British, and made them favourably disposed to the Muslims.

This change in the attitude of the British rulers synchronised with the rise of Sir Syed Ahmed as the leader of the Muslims, and the entirely new turn he gave to their policy and activities. He was deeply impressed by the fact that the Muslims were far behind the Hindus in respect of Western learning, and consequently the Hindus practically monopolised the higher offices of the state. He therefore devoted himself to the promotion of English education among the Muslims, and in 1875 founded a school which soon developed into the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College of Ālīgarh. His efforts were crowned with success. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that no single institution has done so much for any community as this college has done for the promotion of higher education and modern culture among the Muslims.

Sir Syed Ahmad was an ardent patriot and nationalist. He supported the Ilbert Bill and the agitation in favour of holding simultaneous examinations for the Civil Service. He held that the Hindus and Muslims in India formed one nation. "They are," he said, "two eyes of India. Injure the one and you injure the other. We should try to become one in heart and soul and act in unison; if united, we can support each other, if not, the effect of one against the other will tend to the destruction and downfall of both." He further expressed the view that "no nation can acquire honour and respect so long as it does not attain equality with the ruling race and does not participate in the government of its own country". But in spite of these liberal views Sir Syed was definitely opposed to the Congress movement from the very beginning. He urged the Muslim community to keep aloof from it and denounced its objectives, including the simultaneous examinations for the Civil Service which he had once advocated. In 1886 he set up an Educational Congress as a rival organisation on the ground that the Muslims would not benefit by the discussion of political matters, and education was the only means of ensuring their progress. He also established two other Associations in order to oppose the Congress. The first, the United Indian Patriotic Association, founded in 1888, had both Hindu and Muslim members, but the second, founded in 1893 and known as the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association of Upper India, confined its membership to Muslims and Englishmen.

There can scarcely be any doubt that the change in Sir Syed Ahmad's attitude was partly due to the British policy of "Divide and Rule", now applied against the Hindus. This policy found a great exponent in Mr. Beck, the Principal of the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh from 1883 to 1899. Throughout this long period Mr. Beck worked with unremitting zeal and industry in order to wean Sir Syed Ahmad from the nationalist movement, and to induce the Muslims to keep aloof from the

Hindus, and place themselves under the protecting wings of the British Government. But it is not necessary to suppose that Beck's efforts, though highly successful, were solely responsible for Sir Syed Ahmad's opposition to the Congress. It is quite likely that he had a sincere conviction that English education was the crying need of the community and it would be unwise to divert its energy to politics. It is also possible that he detected in the Congress demand for popular government something highly injurious to the Muslim cause. After all, the Muslims formed but one-fourth of the population of India, and Sir Syed Ahmad publicly expressed his fears that under a democratic system of government, which formed the ideal of the Congress leaders, "the larger community would fully override the interests of the smaller community". This sentiment has been shared by the Muslim leaders ever since, and has largely shaped their views and actions. Sir Syed Ahmad died in 1898, and Mr. Beck in 1899, but their policy survived and formed the background of Muslim politics in subsequent years. Though even then, as later, some eminent Muslim leaders occasionally took more catholic views, adopted a nationalist policy, and even became ardent champions of the Congress, they could not carry the whole community with them, and in some notable cases they ultimately fell into line with the old policy. The dread of majority rule, first publicly expressed by Sir Syed, and widely spread by the propaganda of Beck and his successors, inspired, in the successive stages of evolution in Muslim politics, the demands for nomination, for a separate electorate with weightage, and lastly for Pakistan, as will be related in a subsequent chapter.

4. Trade and Industry

A. Trade

It has been already noted how the foreign trade of India passed into the hands of European nations, notably the English. Although the trading monopoly of the East India Company was abolished in 1813, and gradually all the European nations were placed on an equal footing in respect of trade in India, the British nation virtually possessed the monopoly of Indian trade until the closing years of the nineteenth century. This was due partly to the undoubted maritime supremacy of the British and partly to their political domination in India, while other historical causes operated in the same direction. Only during the last part of the nineteenth century did Germany and Japan begin to encroach upon the close preserve of British trade in India.

The volume of overseas trade began to increase enormously with the opening of the Suez Canal. In 1855–1860 the average annual value of Indian trade was about fifty-two lakhs of rupees. During the five years beginning with 1869, when the Suez Canal was opened, the average annual

value of exports and imports amounted to nearly ninety crores of rupees. The average in 1900 exceeded two hundred crores, while in 1928–1929 it exceeded six hundred crores.

The nature of exports and imports also changed. Instead of the finished products of industry, India now exported jute, wheat, cotton, oilseeds, tea, etc., whereas she imported the goods of European manufacture to which reference will be made later.

The large volume of foreign trade presupposes a corresponding extension of inland trade. This was facilitated by the era of peace introduced by British rule, the gradual abolition of the vexatious inland transit duties and the development of the means of transport and communication.

The transit duties were gradually abolished in the provinces between 1836 and 1844, and by 1848 inter-provincial trade was rendered free from them.

The development of communications by means of railways, steamships, canals, telegraphs, and cables, which revolutionised Indian trade, mostly took place after 1858. Up to the Revolt railways were practically unknown in India, except for a few miles around Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. But the disasters of the Revolt opened the eyes of the Government to the value of rapid means of communication. By 1871 a general system of railways was completed connecting the different provinces, and the hinterland of each province with its ports. The construction of telegraphs was begun in 1851 and a really effective postal system, with cheap postage rates, was introduced in 1854. The first steamships plied on the Ganges only a few years before the Revolt. As regards the development of roads and canals, no appreciable work was done till the Public Works Department was organised in 1854–1855 by Lord Dalhousie. Lastly, it was in 1865 that the first telegraphic connection was established between India and Europe.

B. Industry

In a previous chapter we have traced the decline and decay of Indian trade and industry. The advent of new and cheap machine-made goods from the West gradually changed men's tastes and habits. The old Indian products were almost completely ousted to make room for foreign imports, and a list of imports into India during the latter part of the nineteenth century is an interesting study both from the economic and social points of view. It consisted of articles of luxury such as silks and woollens, leather and leather goods, cabinet-ware and furniture, clocks and watches, earthenware and porcelain, glass and glassware, paper, pasteboard, stationery, toys and requisites for games, scents, cigarettes, carts and carriges, and more recently bicycles, motor-cycles and motor-cars. To this must be added articles which have almost become a necessity in every household, such as matches, sewing

machines, umbrellas, soap, cheap glass and chinaware, pens and nibs, aluminium and enamelled ironware, torches and kerosene oil. Neither list is exhaustive. But the imported articles indicate the growth of new habits and tastes, which have proved destructive to Indian industries, such as the manufacture of fine wool, silk and cotton goods, bell-metal ware, etc., which might otherwise have flourished even now.

Thus slowly but steadily the Indian markets were inundated with foreign manufactured goods and the old home-industry of India came to occupy almost a negligible place in the Indian economy.

Gradually India rose from the stupor in which she was cast by this sudden blow from the West. It was impossible that a highly civilised and intellectual race like the Indians should acquiesce for long in playing the role of hewers of wood and drawers of water in the industrial world. Slowly industries began to be organised on modern lines, and the effect was appreciably marked on the exports and imports of India during the seventies of the last century. Thus the proportion of manufactured exports to total exports of India rose from 8 per cent in 1879 to 16 per cent in 1892 and to 22 per cent in 1907–1908; while the proportion of manufactured imports to total imports fell from 65 per cent in 1879 to 57 per cent in 1892 and to 53 per cent in 1907.

Among the more important organised industries in India, on a large scale, may be mentioned cotton, jute, iron and steel, paper, tanning and leather. But up to the end of the nineteenth century they made very small advance, compared with the total volume of trade in these commodities. Still it was a good beginning and had immense possibilities. It is also to be noted that these big industries were not always managed by Indians, some of them being owned by Europeans.

The nature and extent of this new industrial awakening in India is well illustrated by the history of cotton mills. Apart from isolated instances, such as a mill erected in Calcutta in 1818, the industry was at first centred in Bombay where the first mill was started in 1854. After 1877 several cotton mills were started in cotton-producing areas like Nāgpur, Ahmadābād, Sholāpur, and some other places. The Swadeshī movement in Bengal in 1905 gave a fillip to this industry, and since then large numbers of mills have been started, including several in Bengal.

But this nascent industry, like others, had to make its way against enormous odds. It had to fight for a place in the market securely held by the West and had to compete against the long and mature experience and unlimited capital of Western manufacturers. In this unequal contest it could not hope for any support from the Government. Rather, as events showed, it had at first to face its direct hostility. Lancashire manufacturers grew restive at the success of Indian mills, and owing to their pressure the Government of India excluded the manufactured English cotton goods from the usual import duty which acted as a protection to Indian industry. When on account of financial difficulties, the import duty had to be reimposed, the

Lancashire interests had to be placated by the imposition of a countervailing excise duty on cotton manufactures in Bombay (p. 857). To the utter misfortune of India, her industry fell an equal victim to the protectionist policy of England in the eighteenth century and the free-trade policy of the nineteenth century, both the opposing principles operating favourably to British and unfavourably to Indian industry. These difficulties partially explain the very slow growth of Indian industry.

CHAPTER V

POLITICAL RELATIONS, 1906–1937

1. The North-West Frontier

THE vexed problem of the North-West Frontier engaged the serious attention of Lord Curzon, who found on his arrival in India in January, 1899, that about 10,000 British troops had been quartered on the farther side of the British frontier. The new Viceroy followed in regard to the tribal tracts a course of policy which has been described as "one of withdrawal and concentration". He ably defended the retention of Chitral and the construction of the road from that town to Peshawar, but in other respects differed from the policy of the "forward" school. Under his orders large numbers of British troops were gradually withdrawn from the Khyber Pass, the Kurram valley, Wāziristān and the tribal area generally, but some posts were retained and fortified at Chakdarra, Malakand and Dargai. The place of the British troops withdrawn was filled by tribal levies under British officers, or by military police. British forces were, however, concentrated within British lines, and strategic railways were constructed up to Dargai at the base of the Malakand, Jāmrud, at the entrance to the Khyber Pass, and Thal, at the mouth of the Kurram valley. At the same time Lord Curzon was careful to regulate and limit the importation of arms to tribesmen and also to encourage the important tribes to maintain peace and tranquillity and check crime by granting them allowances at regular intervals.

Another aspect of Lord Curzon's policy was the creation of the North-West Frontier Province in 1901 in the teeth of much opposition from the Punjab officials. Formerly the north-west frontier districts had been under the control of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, subject only to the indirect control of the Government of India. The new Frontier Province, extending over an area of 40,000 square miles, included the political agencies of the Malakand, the Kurram, the Khyber, the Tochi and Wana, and all the trans-Indus districts of the Punjab, excepting the settled district of Derā Ghāzi Khān which remained under the control of the Punjab Government. It was placed under a Chief Commissioner, directly responsible to the Government of India. The old North-Western Provinces were given the name of "the United Provinces of Āgra and Oudh".

The civil and military reforms of Lord Curzon on the North-West Frontier gave comparative peace after a period of severe fighting and reduced to some extent the heavy expenditure caused by frontier wars. It was, of course, necessary to blockade the Mahsūds in 1900–1902, and deal with the risings of the Mohmānds and Zakka Khel in 1908–1909, but Lord Curzon claimed that during his seven years of office, he had spent only £248,000 on military activities on the North-West Frontier as against £4,584,000 in the years 1894–1898.

Lord Curzon did not, however, finally solve the Frontier problem. His system could not thoroughly check the spirit of restlessness so prominent among the local tribes, and administrative difficulties regarding justice and revenue continued to trouble both the settled districts and the tribal areas. The pillars of his system fell under the strain of general unrest engendered by the Great War of 1914–1918. The changed conditions made the Government of India pursue a vigorous policy in the North-West Frontier, marked by the retaining of commanding posts at important points, opening up the country by roads, entrusting the regular troops with the duties of the Militia for policing the tribal lines, and by attempts to introduce among the tribes the elements of a new civilisation. The influence of the Indian National Movement, and the attempts of the Government to introduce social and educational reforms, not to the liking of the tribes, complicated the problem to a great extent. In fact, the Government of India had to resort to extensive military preparations in suppressing frontier outbreaks in recent times, such as the rising of the Wāziris in 1919, that of the Mahsūds in 1925, the serious rising of the Wāziris, Mohmānds and Āfrids in 1930–1931, the Mohmānd outbreak in 1933 and the Tori Khel rebellion of 1936–1937.

2. British Relations with Afghānistān and Persia

A. Afghānistān

The relations of the Government of India with Afghānistān were influenced considerably by the political, commercial and constructional activities of Russia in the Persian Gulf and Central Asia and also by the intrigues of the German, Austrian and Turkish missions at Kābul during the war of 1914–1918. On the death of the Amīr, 'Abdur Rahmān, who had concluded a friendly treaty with the British Government, in September 1901, Lord Curzon had some trouble with his successor, Amir Habibullah, over the renewal of the treaty. Habibullah claimed that it was an agreement between the two countries and did not require renewing on the death of the Amīr; but Lord Curzon argued that the treaty with the late Amīr was a personal one and insisted on its renewal. For some years all communications with the Government of India were stopped by Amīr Habibullah,

who refrained from drawing his subsidy and claimed the title of "His Majesty". He was undoubtedly encouraged by the anti-English activities of Russia. But in November, 1904, during Lord Curzon's absence from India, the acting Viceroy, Lord Ampthill, sent a mission to Kābul under Sir Louis Dane. A treaty was concluded in March, 1905, by which all the engagements between the British Government and 'Abdur Rahmān were renewed and Amīr Habibullah's claim to the title of "His Majesty" conceded.

The tables were, however, turned two years later after the signing of the Anglo-Russian Convention in August, 1907. According to this Russia agreed to treat Afghānistān as outside her sphere of influence and equal commercial facilities were provided for England and Russia in that kingdom. The Amīr, who "regarded this union of the two great neighbours with natural suspicion", refused to give his consent to the clauses of the Convention. But this counted for nothing, as Russia stood by the agreement. Henceforth Habibullah remained aloof, but during the First World War he rendered England valuable service by maintaining a policy of strict neutrality in spite of the incitement of hostile parties.

The combination of the European powers, and their attempts to introduce Western civilisation in Afghānistān, gave an impetus to Pan-Islamic forces in that country, which became formidable after the fall of the Tsarist Government in Russia in 1917 and the consequent disappearance of Anglo-Russian friendship. Amīr Habibullah made himself unpopular with the orthodox and anti-British party in Afghānistān by his attempts to introduce European manners and customs into his land and was assassinated on 20th February, 1919.

A short struggle for the throne ensued in which Amānullah, a son of the murdered Amīr, came out successful. Partly under the pressure of internal troubles, and partly under the influence of the war party, Amanullah decided to embark on a war with the English. Thus began the Third Anglo-Afghān War (April–May, 1919). The use of aeroplanes, wireless, and high explosives enabled the British Indian army to defeat the Afghān army severely and bomb Jalālābād and Kābul within ten days. The Afghāns asked for an armistice on 14th May and a treaty of peace was signed at Rāwalpindi on 8th August, 1919, which was confirmed by another treaty concluded on 22nd November, 1921. According to the terms of these treaties, the Afghāns were prohibited from importing arms or munitions through India, and the arrears of the late Amīr's subsidy were confiscated by the British Government and no new grant was made to the new Amīr; but the British Government expressed their desire to make no attempt to control any longer the foreign relations of Afghānistān, and both the parties agreed to respect each other's independence. An accredited British minister was henceforth to reside at Kābul, and the Amīr was to be represented by one of his own ministers residing in London. Since then Anglo-Afghān

relations have continued to be cordial in spite of occasional minor disturbances and Bolshevik activities in Afghānistān.

But soon Afghānistān was convulsed by a civil war. On returning from his European tour in the summer of 1928, Amīr Amānullah, full of reforming zeal, tried to introduce certain internal reforms, social, educational and legal, which were not liked by the conservative sections of the people of his kingdom. Their discontent found expression in a civil war and in May, 1929, Amānullah was compelled to abdicate the throne, which was usurped by Bachai-i-Saqqao, a daring adventurer. During the troubles caused by this upheaval, Kābul was cut off from communication with other countries, but the Royal Air Force succeeded in bringing away large numbers of British Indian subjects, many foreigners, and finally, on 25th February, 1929, the Legation itself. While watching the course of the Afghān civil war with grave anxiety, the Government of India followed a policy of "scrupulous non-intervention". Order was eventually restored in Afghānistān by Muhammad Nādir Shāh, a scion of the old ruling house and an able officer of the expelled Amīr, who became Amīr by general choice. With considerable knowledge of the world, he took up again Amānullah's mantle of reform, but proceeded with much caution and tact with his schemes of modernization. Relations between Afghānistān and India again became satisfactory. But this course of events was tragically interrupted by the assassination of King Nādir Shāh on 8th November, 1933, by a fanatic with a personal grudge. His son, Muhammad Zahir, however, peacefully ascended the throne and wisely continued the policy of his father.

Recently the Indo-Afghān accord has been reaffirmed. India and Afghānistān issued a Joint Communique on 24th June, 1974. Both the countries agreed upon "a far-reaching and wide-ranging programme" of economic co-operation which "would involve no financial limits".

B. Persia

Great Britain had vital interests in the Middle East, and especially in the Persian Gulf, for political as well as commercial reasons, and she guarded these as jealously as possible. But other powers, like France, Russia, Germany and Turkey, challenged, during the closing years of the nineteenth century, the exclusive influence of Britain in the Persian Gulf and tried to establish their respective control over it. Russian penetration into Northern Persia was particularly a matter of grave anxiety for England. The Government of India vigorously resisted the claims of these powers, and frustrated their efforts. Lord Lansdowne, the British Foreign Secretary, declared in the House of Lords on 5th May, 1903: "I say it without hesitation, that we should regard the establishment of a naval base or of a fortified post in the Persian Gulf by any other Power as a grave menace to British interests, and we should certainly resist it by all means at our disposal."

The first effective steps to counter these anti-British influences in the Persian Gulf were taken by Lord Curzon, who visited the Gulf in 1903 and tried to protect British interests there by several measures, such as the establishment of consulates in the ports and trading centres in the interior, the Seistān Mission of 1903-1905 which under Sir Henry MacMahon brought to a completion the work of boundary delimitation begun in 1872 by Sir Frederick Goldsmith, the projection of a railway from Quetta to Nushki, the construction of a road from Nushki to Robat Kila, a frontier post, the opening of a postal service along the route and the reorganisation of customs and tariffs.

Soon Persia became subject to grave internal disorders due to the conflict between the forces of constitutionalism, favoured by her people, and the forces of autocracy, represented by the ruling dynasty. England and Russia, however, decided to determine the sphere of their respective interests in Persian territory by a peaceful settlement, and thus signed the Anglo-Russian Convention on 31st August, 1907. According to this, the two parties agreed to pay due regard to the integrity and political independence of Persia. A Russian sphere of influence was demarcated in Northern Persia and a British sphere in the south-eastern provinces. Each power agreed in regard to the other's sphere of influence " not to seek for herself or her own subjects or those of any other country any political or commercial concessions such as railway, banking, telegraph, roads, transport, or insurance ", and not to prevent the other party from acquiring such concessions there.

There is no doubt that the Convention served to avert serious conflicts between England and Russia during the critical period, 1907–1910, when Persia was in a state of chaos which might have tempted any power to intervene in her affairs to further its designs. But it was not above criticism. As Sykes points out, it " gave grave offence to the Persians ", who were not consulted in the least about the new settlement which vitally affected their destiny. There is much truth in the significant observation of Lovat Fraser, with reference to this agreement, that " there is something amazingly cynical in the spirit in which Western powers dispose of the heritage of other races ". In the opinion of some, the Convention gave more advantages to Russia than to England. While the sphere of influence of the former extended over half the territory of Persia, that of the latter was rather too small. But there was one factor which England could not very well ignore. Russia had already penetrated far too deep into Northern Persia to be asked to retreat quietly, and so, in consideration of this, one has to agree with the statement of Sir J. D. Rees that Great Britain " had not so much given away advantages as accepted a position that had grown up ".

During the War of 1914–1918, Persia, herself in a miserable condition due to the continuance of internal troubles, declared strict neutrality. But Germany and also her ally Turkey, acting for herself or as the *avant-courier* of

Germany, tried to " embarrass Great Britain and Russia by creating disturbances in Persia, in Afghānistān and on the frontiers of India, and to force Persia into the World War on their side ". This stirred Great Britain to an unusual activity in the Persian Gulf. However, her relations with Persia continued on the whole to be friendly.

3. The North-Eastern Frontier

A. Tibet and the States on the Northern Frontier

Though nominally subject to the suzerainty of China, Tibet was for all practical purposes an independent theocracy under the two great Lāmās, the Dalāi Lāmā of Lhāsā and the Tashi Lāmā of the famous monastery of Tashilhunpo near Shigatse. Political power was centred in the hands of the Dalāi Lāmā or the council that ruled during his minority.

The earliest attempts to establish British relations with Tibet were made as early as the year 1774. Warren Hastings sent Bogle on a mission to the Tashi Lāmā of Shigatse. The object was mainly to obtain facilities for trade with that country. But in subsequent times the Tibetans began to resent British intercourse with their country. In 1887 they made an " inexplicable invasion " into the protected State of Sikkim, but were driven out the next year by General Graham. The provisions of the Anglo-Chinese Convention of 1890, relating to the Sikkim-Tibet boundary and some commercial facilities, made more definite in 1893, were coldly received by the Tibetans.

On his arrival in India, Lord Curzon found British relations with Tibet " at an absolute deadlock ". The problem became more complicated at this time through two factors. On the one hand, the Dalāi Lāmā having passed beyond his period of minority had overthrown the regency government by a *coup d'état* with the help of his tutor, Dorjieff, a Russian Buddhist, and had been trying to show himself a strong ruler. On the other hand, the Tibetans, eager to throw off Chinese sovereignty, were willing to welcome Russian friendship as a counterpoise. Dorjieff led Tibetan missions to Russia in 1898, 1900, and 1901, and rumours spread that he had concluded a treaty with Russia virtually placing Tibet under the protectorate of Russia. The Russian Government officially contradicted this rumour and assured the British ambassador at St. Petersburg that the object of these missions was religious. But this could not remove England's suspicions about Russian designs. As a matter of fact, British policy in Tibet represented but one phase in the long-drawn-out rivalry between England and Russia in Central Asia.

To meet the situation, Lord Curzon proposed in 1903 to send a mission to Tibet, with an armed escort, which the Home Government sanctioned with much hesitation. A mission under Colonel Younghusband accordingly

started for Tibet, and after several sharp encounters with the Tibetans reached Lhāsā on 3rd August, 1904. Finally, a convention was signed, by which the Tibetans agreed to open trade marts in Gyantse, Gartok and Yatung, to pay an indemnity of twenty-five lakhs and to allow the English to occupy the Chumbi valley for three years as a temporary pledge. In June, 1906, England and China concluded a convention by which the former agreed neither to annex Tibetan territory nor to interfere in the internal administration of Tibet and the latter promised not to allow any other foreign power to interfere with the internal administration or territorial integrity of Tibet. Further, England was granted the power to open telegraph lines connecting the trading stations with India, and the provisions of the Convention of 1890, and the Trade Regulations of 1893, were declared to be in force. The indemnity was paid by the Chinese Government in three years and the English evacuated the Chumbi valley.

The political results of the Younghusband mission were not very important. Its only direct result was the opening of three trade marts and the establishment of a British Trade Agent at Gyantse. Younghusband is given the credit of "unveiling Lhāsā", but it should not be forgotten that in ancient and medieval times Buddhist monks from Bengal had penetrated into Tibet on religious missions, and also that, long before Younghusband, a famous scholar and explorer, Rai Bahādur Sarat Chandra Das, C.I.E., having no dread of the unknown, had entered the forbidden land of the Dalāi Lāmā at the risk of his life.

By the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907, both England and Russia agreed to carry on political relations with Tibet through China. The suzerainty of China over Tibet, hitherto a mere "constitutional fiction", was now explicitly reaffirmed, but in 1910, in violation of this convention, China invaded Tibet and occupied the whole country. The Dalāi Lāmā took refuge in India. Taking advantage of the Revolution in China in 1911 leading to the fall of the ruling Manchu dynasty, the Tibetans revolted against the Chinese and drove them from Tibet. The Dalāi Lāmā returned to Tibet in June, 1912, and claimed that the old vassal-suzerain relationship which was based on his personal allegiance to the Manchu Emperors had come to an end with the extinction of the Manchu dynasty. He assumed full and complete sovereign rights over Tibet. In order to ease the tense situation caused by the refusal of Tibet to accept Chinese overlordship and to maintain peace along India's northern frontier when a big European war was almost in sight, the British invited the representatives of China and Tibet to a Tripartite Conference at Simla in 1913. On 27th April, 1914, a convention was initialled by the representatives of the three Governments. Under its terms Tibet was divided into two zones and the suzerainty of China over both was recognized. But China agreed to recognize the complete autonomy of "Outer Tibet", skirting the Indian frontier and including Lhāsā, Shigatse and Chamdo, and to abstain from all interference

in its administration. She engaged to abstain from sending troops, stationing civil or military officers or establishing Chinese colonies there.

The Simla Conference also fixed the frontier between Tibet and North-eastern India from the east of Bhutān for a distance of 850 miles. This frontier came to be called the MacMahon Line, for Sir Henry MacMahon, Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department, acting as the British Plenipotentiary, signed it on behalf of the British Government.

Although the Convention was initialled by the Chinese Plenipotentiary, the Chinese Government refused to ratify it. But later, China notified Great Britain that except as regards the boundary between Outer and Inner Tibet she agreed to the Convention in all respects. Thus China acknowledged the MacMahon Line to be the boundary between Tibet and North-eastern India.[1]

The changes in Russia after the revolution of 1917, and the growing confusion in China, relieved the Government of India of the menace of external forces affecting English interests in Tibet, and Britain and Tibet since then remained on terms of cordiality with each other. A British Goodwill Mission, led by Mr. B. J. Gould, I.C.S., of the Political Department, visited Tibet during the winter of 1936–1937 and established or renewed friendly relations with the chief officials of the Tibetan Government and the people of Tibet.

Relations with Nepāl, Sikkim and Bhutān, with which India's northern frontiers are in contact, were cordial. To resist Chinese activities in Tibet, the Government of India in 1910 strengthened their relations with Bhutān by raising the amount of their subsidy from fifty thousand to a lakh of rupees a year and undertaking to guide Bhutān in her foreign relations. The Government afterwards officially notified China that they would protect the rights and interests of Bhutān and Sikkim.

Sikkim became in May, 1975, an "Associate" State. India's ties of friendship with Bhutān have been strengthened. King Jigme Singye Wangchuk recently visited India and he observed that his talks with senior Indian leaders in New Dèlhi had been "most fruitful and rewarding". The talks have been useful for India as well. There would be a common approach to matters directly affecting the two countries and their foreign policies would continue to be closely co-ordinated. Bhutān now has a constitutional form of Government, like that of India, in the place of an absolute monarchy.

B. Assam and Burma

On the partition of Bengal in 1905, the new province of Eastern Bengal and Assam was formed by the amalgamation of Assam and the Surmā valley with fifteen districts of the old Bengal province. But this arrangement being

[1]Dr. P. C. Chakravarti, *Iinda-China Relations*, pp. 21–25.

annulled in 1912, Assam was again made a separate administrative unit. Of the several Assam border tribes, such as the Daflas, the Miris, the Abors and the Mishmis, none gave much trouble to the British Government except the Abors. In 1911 the Minyong Abors murdered Mr. Williamson and Dr. Gregorson, whereupon the Government of India sent an expedition to the Dihang valley of the Abor country on the north-east frontier, to subdue the tribe. The expedition proved successful in its object, and friendly missions were sent to the Miri and Mishmi countries. Owing to the rather undefined boundary of the Chinese province of Yunnan on the frontier of Burma, the British Government apprehended minor incursions into Burmese territory, and carefully guarded this frontier. Negotiations between China and Great Britain were carried on with a view to settling the frontier between Burma and the Chinese province of Yunnan, and a Delimitation Commission, consisting of British and Chinese Commissioners, with the famous Swiss engineer, Colonel F. Iselin, as its neutral Chairman, conducted enquiries into this matter during 1935 and 1936 and submitted a unanimous report in the spring of 1937, which definitely fixed the frontier line between Burma and Yunnan.

CHAPTER VI

CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES, 1906–1937

1. Whitehall and the Government of India

THE control of the British Parliament over the Government of India exercised through the Secretary of State was firmly held, and even a strong personality like Lord Curzon was overruled by the Home Government. The power of superintendence and direction was vigorously asserted by Lord Morley as the Secretary of State for India, and he claimed a larger and more direct share in Indian administration than his predecessors had done. Mr. Lovat Fraser observed in the *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1918: " Lord Morley... whatever his virtues may have been, was certainly the most autocratic and the least constitutional Secretary of State ever seen in Whitehall." But the Governor-General being the man on the spot, his " old discretionary power " did not altogether disappear.

During the early years of the present century, some Indian politicians, including the late Mr. Gokhale, demanded certain changes in the Home Government, particularly the abolition of the Indian Council. In 1907 two Indian gentlemen were appointed members of Lord Morley's Council. A Committee, appointed in 1919, with Lord Crewe, an ex-Secretary of State for India, as chairman and Prof. A. B. Keith and Mr. B. N. Basu among others as members, to examine and report on the working of the Home Government, recommended the total abolition of the Indian Council. But the recommendation was not accepted by the Joint Committee of Parliament. The Committee advocated certain changes in details which were given effect to by the Act of 1919.[1] Vacancies in the Council were to be filled, as before, by the Secretary of State, but henceforth it was to consist of not less than eight and not more than twelve members, half of whom were to be qualified by not less than ten years' residence or service in India and must have left India only recently. Their term of office was reduced from seven to five years. The concurrence of a majority vote of the Council was required only in cases of (i) the grant or appropriation of any portion of the revenues of India, (ii) the making of contracts, and (iii) the framing of rules to regulate matters relating to the Civil Service. The Council

[1]For the Acts of 1919 and 1935 referred to in this section, *see* Section 2.

remained clearly subordinate to the Secretary of State, who retained his discretionary powers not only in relation to it but also in relation to the Government of India, particularly for Imperial or Military affairs, foreign relations, the rights of European British subjects, the law of naturalisation, the Public Debt, customs, currency and shipping. His control was restricted only over " transferred " subjects. Before 1919 the salary of the Secretary of State, and the expenses of his department, were paid from the Indian revenues. As a result Parliament could not criticise the Indian Budget in the same way as the Budget presented by the British Chancellor of the Exchequer. With a view to bringing the Secretary of State under more effective criticism by Parliament, the Act of 1919 provided that " the salary of the Secretary of State shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament, and the salaries of his under-secretaries or any other expenses of his department may be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament ". A Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament was appointed to consider Indian questions, rules and enactments, that were laid before the Houses. Thus indirectly the control of Parliament over British India was strengthened.

The Government of India Act, 1935 changed the legal position of the Secretary of State. According to it, " all rights, authority or jurisdiction in or in relation to territories in India " were to rest with the British Crown. The Governor-General or Provincial Governor exercising executive authority on behalf of His Majesty was to be, while acting in his discretion, under the general control of the Secretary of State, who was a member of the British Cabinet and was responsible to Parliament in all matters relating to India. In substance the authority of the Secretary of State remained almost unchanged but for some relaxation due to the introduction of autonomy in certain provinces and partial responsibility at the Centre in case a Federation came into being. He continued to " stand at the top of the Indian administration as its guardian ". As provided by the Act of 1935, the India Council was abolished from 1st April, 1937, and in its place the Secretary of State was given a body of advisers not less than three or more than six in number, of whom half at least must have served for ten years under the Crown in India and must have been appointed within two years of ceasing to work in India. The Secretary of State had full liberty in his discretion to consult his advisers collectively or individually or to ignore them, and he might act or refuse to act according to their advice except in certain specified cases, such as the exercise of powers conferred on him in regard to the Services under the Crown, for which the concurrence of at least one half of the members present at the meeting was necessary.

To relieve the Secretary of State of agency work for the Central and Provincial Governments of India, the Act of 1919 provided for the office of High Commissioner, which was established by Order in Council of 13th August, 1920. He was to be appointed by the Government of India, to whom he remained primarily responsible, and his salary was to be paid

from Indian revenues. His duties were to procure stores for Indian governments, to supply trade information, to promote the interests of Indian commerce, to look after the education of Indian students in England, and to furnish information on India to enquirers. He also represented India as one of the delegates at International Conferences. Under the Act of 1935, the High Commissioner was to be controlled by the Governor-General in his " individual judgment ", and he might act, if empowered by the Governor-General, for a province, a federated State, or Burma.

2. The Indian Government

The strong regime of Lord Curzon, instead of checking the forces of Indian nationalism, intensified the desire for political advance among the Indians, which manifested itself in some places in an extreme form. Besides taking some measures to assert the law, Government planned certain constitutional changes, which were embodied in the Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909. These reforms provided for the association of qualified Indians with Government to a greater extent in deciding public questions. Thus one seat on the Governor-General's Executive Council was, in actual practice, reserved for an Indian member. Satyendra Prasanna Sinha (afterwards the first Lord Sinha of Raipur) was the first Indian to attain the honour of being appointed Law Member of the Governor-General's Council. The members of the Executive Councils of the Governors of Madras and Bombay were increased to four. An Executive Council was introduced in Bengal in 1909, and when Bihār and Orissa was created a separate province in 1912 it also was given an Executive Council in that year, though three years later such a proposal for the United Provinces was set aside. It should also be noted that, though the Act of 1909 did not specifically provide for the appointment of Indians on provincial Executive Councils, the practice was begun of including such members in them, Rājā Kishori Lāl Goswāmī being appointed a member of the Executive Council of Bengal.

The most striking feature of the Act of 1909 was that it introduced important changes in the composition and functions of the Legislative Councils. The number of additional members of the Central Legislature was raised from sixteen to a maximum of sixty, of whom not more than twenty-eight were to be officials. The Governor-General had the power to nominate three non-officials to represent certain specified communities and had also at his disposal two other seats to be filled by nomination. The remaining twenty-seven seats were to be filled by non-official elected members, some of whom represented certain special constituencies such as the landowners in seven provinces, the Muhammadans in five provinces, and two Chambers of Commerce in Calcutta and Bombay, while thirteen others were to be elected by the non-official members of the nine provincial Legislative

Councils. Thus a small official majority was retained in the Central Legislative Council. Lord Morley clearly laid down that the Governor-General's Council " in its legislative as well as its executive character should continue to be so constituted as to ensure its constant and uninterrupted power to fulfil the constitutional obligations that it owes and must always owe to His Majesty's Government and to the Imperial Parliament ". In the provincial Legislative Councils, the number of additional members was raised to a maximum of fifty in the major provinces; and it was so arranged that a combination of official and nominated non-official members might have a small majority over the elected members, except in Bengal where there was a clear elected majority. The greater part of these additional non-official members were to be elected by groups of local bodies, landholders, trade associations and universities. By conceding the demand of the Muhammadan community for separate representation by members chosen by the votes of a Muslim electorate, the Reforms of 1909 introduced the principle of communal representation, which, as the Indian Statutory Commission observed in 1929, became " a cardinal problem and ground of controversy at every revision of the Indian electoral system ".

As regards the functions of the Legislatures, the Act of 1909 empowered them to discuss, and to move resolutions on, the Budget, before it was finally settled, and also certain matters of general interest. Their resolutions were to be expressed and to be operative as recommendations to the Executive Government and any of them might be disallowed by the Head of the Government acting as President of the Council at his discretion. No resolutions could be moved in matters concerning the Army, Foreign Relations, the Indian States and sundry other matters.

Though the Morley-Minto Reforms marked an important step in the introduction of representative government, they did not give Parliamentary Government to India. This was plainly admitted by Lord Morley himself, when he said in the House of Lords on 17th December, 1908: " If it could be said that this chapter of reforms led directly or necessarily to the establishment of a parliamentary system in India, I, for one, would have nothing at all to do with it." In fact, Indian administration still continued to be carried on with absolute responsibility to Whitehall. The non-official members could not act in a responsible manner, as nothing that they might say could lead to any modification in the fundamental policy of the Government. As the authors of the Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, 1918, observed, " the reforms of 1909 afforded no answer and could afford no answer, to Indian political problems....Responsibility is the savour of popular government, and that savour the present councils wholly lack ". Indirect election and separate communal representation had also obvious disadvantages.

The Morley-Minto Reforms did not come up to the expectation of the Indian people, whose discontent continued unabated. They renewed their

claims with emphasis during the First World War, which broke out within five years of the introduction of these Reforms; and two schemes were put forward, one by Mr. G. K. Gokhale and the other jointly by the National Congress and the Muslim League. To satisfy the widespread demands of the Indians for constitutional reforms, and in recognition of their loyal services to Great Britain during the war, Mr. Edwin Montagu, the Secretary of State for India, made the famous announcement in the House of Commons on 20th August, 1917, that "*the policy of His Majesty's Government, with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire*". He came to India early in November, 1917, and having ascertained public opinion in this country by an extensive tour, published in April, 1918, the Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, commonly known as the Montagu-Chelmsford Report.[1] This Report formed the basis of the Government of India Act, 1919, which came into operation early in 1921.

This Act made a clear division, as far as possible, of the functions of the Central and Provincial Governments. The Centre was entrusted with duties regarding defence, political and external affairs, the principal railways and other strategic communications, posts and telegraphs, currency and coinage, the Public Debt, commerce, civil and criminal law and procedure, ecclesiastical administration, the All-India Services, certain institutions of research and all other matters not mentioned as provincial subjects. The Provincial Governments were charged with duties in respect of internal law and order, administration of justice and jails, irrigation, forests, inspection of factories, supervision of labour questions, famine relief, land revenue administration, local self-government, education, medical department, sanitation and public health, public works, agriculture, development of industries, excise and co-operative societies. The spheres of the Central and Provincial Governments with regard to the source of income and the heads of revenue were also delimited.

We have already noted the effect of the Act of 1919 on the Home Government. We have now to study how it modified the Government of India. It did not introduce diarchy in the Central Government, and the Governor-General remained, as before, directly responsible to the Secretary of State and Parliament, and not to the Indian Legislature. The Executive Council was enlarged. Though it was not laid down in the Act, yet after 1921 the practice prevailed of choosing three of the members from among qualified Indians. Lord Sinha was succeeded by Sir 'Alī Imam as Law Member, but the next Indian member, Sir Sankaran Nair, was given the

[1]The Report bore the joint signature of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford, the Governor-General, but, as we know from Mr. Montagu's *Indian Diary*, the Governor-General played a vacillating and insignificant part in the whole transaction.

portfolio of Education. After 1920 some eminent Indian lawyer invariably held the office of Law Member. The Finance Members were recruited from the British Treasury.

The Central Legislature was thoroughly remodelled and made bi-cameral, the two chambers being the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly. The members of the Executive Council could become members of one or the other house of the Legislature on nomination by the Governor-General. The Council of State or the Upper Chamber was mainly a revising body. It was to consist of not more than 60 members, 34 of whom were to be elected. Not more than 20 were to be officials. The Legislative Assembly, or the lower and the more popular chamber, was to consist of 140 members. The number was later on raised to 145 of whom 105 were elected, 26 were nominated officials and 14 nominated non-officials. Elections to both the houses were direct and the franchise was based on a high property qualification, that for the Assembly being somewhat wider than that for the Council. The tenure of life of the Council of State was fixed at five years and that of the Assembly at three years. But the Governor-General had the power to dissolve either chamber or, in special circumstances, to extend its tenure. The powers of the two chambers were co-ordinate, but demands for grants were submitted to the lower house. In case of a deadlock between the two houses, the Governor-General might summon a joint session. The Council of State was to have a President, nominated by the Governor-General from among its members. The Assembly, too, was to have a President and a Deputy President of its own. The President was to be appointed for the first four years by the Governor-General and thereafter to be elected by the chamber itself.

The powers of the Central Legislature were made extensive in theory. In spite of delimitation of functions between the Central and Provincial Governments, the Central Legislature had the power to enact laws for the whole of British India, subject to the limitation that the previous consent of the Governor-General was necessary for the introduction of Bills in certain matters.[1] Further, if a Bill, recommended by the Governor-General, was thrown out or unsatisfactorily amended by either house, the Governor-General had the power to certify the original Bill as essential for the safety and tranquillity of British India. He was also empowered, in cases of emergency, to promulgate ordinances, which, though originally effective for a period of six months, could be subsequently embodied in law if necessary. Thus the Governor-General was "an important, if not the predo-

[1]A Bill which had for its object the regulation of a Provincial subject or the repeal or amendment of any Act passed by the Provincial Legislature; a bill which sought to repeal or amend any Act or Ordinances passed by the Governor-General; measures affecting the Public Debt or public revenues of India, the religion of any class of British subjects, the discipline of any portion of His Majesty's Military, Naval and Air Forces and the relations of the Government of India with foreign powers or Indian States.

minant, factor of the Indian Legislature ". As regards finance, the Central Legislature was given some control over it with certain specific exceptions. Thus proposals for appropriation of money for purposes of interest and sinking fund charges on loans, for expenditure classified by the Governor-General as political, ecclesiastical and defence, and for the payment of the salaries or pensions of men appointed under the authority of His Majesty or the Secretary of State in Council, were not to be submitted to the vote of the Legislature; but for these an appropriation made by the Government was sufficient. Further, the Governor-General had the power, in cases of emergency, to certifiy any expenditure that he considered essential for the safety and tranquillity of British India or any part thereof. Thus both over legislation and finance the control of the Legislature was in fact greatly limited.

In considering the Provincial Government, we find that the Act of 1919 did away with the distinction between the Regulation Provinces of Bengal, Bombay and Madras and the Non-Regulation Provinces like the Punjab, Assam, etc. All the Provinces, ten in number, with the inclusion of Burma since 1923 and the North-West Frontier Province since 1932, became Governors' Provinces, each having at its head a Governor, appointed by His Majesty. The Governor of a Province, with enormous powers and privileges, continued to remain as the real authority over it. The Act introduced diarchy or dual government in the Provincial Executive. The Governor with his Executive Council was invested with authority over " Reserved subjects ",[1] for the administration of which he was responsible not to the Legislature but to the Governor-General and Whitehall. The " Transferred subjects "[2] were placed in charge of the Governor acting with his Ministers, who were to be appointed by him from the elected members of the Provincial Legislative Council and whose numbers varied from province to province and in the same province at times. The ministers were to hold office during the pleasure of the Governor, as has been the case in theory in Great Britain and Canada, though by convention and practice the principle of ministerial responsibility to the Legislature has been established in both these countries. The ministers were required to retain the confidence of the Legislature, but their responsibility to it tended to " demoralise into an irremovable executive ". Further, the Governor's powers of interference in Transferred subjects were extensive.

The different Provinces were given unicameral legislatures known as Legislative Councils. The membership of each Legislative Council was increased—139 (later on raised to 140) in Bengal, 127 (132) in Madras,

[1]Police, justice and prisons, irrigation, forests (except in Bombay and Burma), famine relief, land-revenue administration and inspection of factories.

[2]Local self-government, education (excepting European education), public health, sanitation and medical administrtaion, public works, agriculture, excise, co-operative societies and development of industries.

123 in U.P., 111 (114) in Bombay, 103 in Bihār and Orissa, 93(94) in the Punjab, 70 (73) in the Central Provinces, and 50 (53) in Assam. At least 70 per cent of the members were to be elected, and of the nominated members not more than 20 per cent were to be officials. Different groups like landowners, chambers of commerce and universities; and communities of Muhammadans, Europeans, Anglo-Indians, Indian Christians and Sikhs in the Punjab were given separate representation through their own electorates. During the first four years the Governor of a Province appointed the President of the local Legislature, and on the expiry of that period the Legislative Councils were given the privilege of electing their own President. Each Legislative Council was given the privilege of entertaining a Bill on any subject concerning the Province. No Bill relating to any of the Transferred subjects could be passed without its consent; but a Bill concerning any of the Reserved subjects might become an Act over its head and in spite of its refusal, if the Governor certified that it was necessary in view of his special responsibility for maintaining the safety and tranquillity of the Province. Further, previous consent of the Governor-General was necessary for introducing certain Bills. As regards finance, it was provided that a budget of the estimated income and expenditure, with the exception of certain items,[1] was to be placed before the Legislative Council in the form of a demand for grants. So far as the Transferred subjects were concerned, the Council could cut down or refuse any demand. But if in the case of Reserved subjects any demand was rejected or modified by the Council, the Governor had the right to certify the expenditure, as provided for in the original demand, as essential for the discharge of his responsibility. Thus both in matters of law-making and finance, the Council's authority over Reserved subjects was strictly limited.

There is no doubt that the Government of India Act, 1919, gave real responsibility to the representatives of the people in only a very limited sphere of administration; and, judged from the standpoint of a truly democratic measure, it had certain defects with regard to both the Central and Provincial Governments. Nevertheless, it should be regarded as an important instalment of constitutional reform. For the first time the British Government officially laid down, as the goal of constitutional development in India, not only Dominion Status but also Responsible Government. The latter could only mean the parliamentary form of government of the British type which was repudiated by Lord Morley even as late as 1908 (see page 902). The introduction of direct election, for the first time, on a comparatively wide franchise was a significant concession. Further, the people were given a valuable opportunity both for political training and for

[1]Provincial contributions to the Central Government; interest and sinking fund charges on loans; the salaries and pensions of officers appointed by or with the approval of His Majesty or the Secretary of State in Council, expenditure of which the amount is prescribed by law.

influencing the actions of the Government. This Act also provided that after the expiry of a decade of working of the new Constitution, a Commission of Enquiry should be constituted, with the approval of Parliament, to report after due investigation whether responsible government should be further extended or restricted.

The Reforms of 1919 did not satisfy the national aspirations of the Indians, and their effect upon the national struggle for independence is described in Chapter IX. The Indian demand for political advance gradually grew more and more insistent. So the Conservative Government of Mr. Baldwin, in which Lord Birkenhead was the Secretary of State for India, appointed a Statutory Commission, earlier than provided in the Act of 1919, under the chairmanship of Sir John Simon, to report on the working of the reforms. As all the seven members of the Commission were British, it was boycotted by the Congressites, the Liberals and important sections of the Muslim community when it landed in Bombay on 3rd February, 1928. There was also a wider ground on which the Congressites took their stand. They held that it did not accord with the principle of self-determination to have consitutional changes effected on the recommendations of a Commission appointed by an outside authority. In view of the difficult situation in India, Sir John Simon wrote a letter to Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, the Premier belonging to the Labour Party which had come to power after the general election of 1929, on 16th October, 1929, suggesting the advisability of inviting, after the publication of the Report of his Commission, the representatives of both British India and the Indian States to a conference before final decisions were made. This suggestion was accepted by the British Cabinet, and on 31st October, 1929, the Governor-General, Lord Irwin, made the momentous announcment " that the natural issue of India's Constitutional progress... is the attainment of Dominion Status " and that a Round Table Conference would be held in London after the Simon Commission had reported.

The Report of the Simon Commission was published in May, 1930. Briefly speaking, it recommended complete Responsible Government in the Provinces, even the control of police and justice being transferred to the Ministers responsible to the Legislatures. Legislatures were to be based on a wider franchise and the official bloc was to go. In the Central Government, it recommended the continuance of complete British authority and control. It pointed out the importance of the growth of contact with the Indian States and envisaged the scheme of an All-India Federation, including the Princes, though its perfect realisation was considered to be a distant possibility. But the recommendations of the Commission were repudiated outright by the Indian nationalists. The British Government then summoned in London a Round Table Conference, consisting of 16 representatives of the three British political parties, 16 delegates from the Indian States and 57 delegates from British India, including some

prominent Indians like Sir Tej Bahādur Sapru, Mr. Srinivāsa Sāstri, Mr. C. Y. Chintāmoni, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar and Sir Mohammad Shafi, to consider the question of the Indian Constitution. The first session of the Conference was held from 12th November, 1930, to 19th January, 1931, and

COUNCIL AND ASSEMBLY BUILDING, DELHI

the Princes declared their willingness to join the proposed Federation provided that responsibility was given to the Central Government. Though the Congress did not at first participate in the Conference, Gandhiji attended the second session (7th September to 1st December, 1931) as its sole representative, but could not get what he wanted. The third session of the Conference, attended by a far smaller number of representatives than before, met from 17th November to 24th December, 1932.

As a result of the discussions at the Conferences, the British Government drafted its proposals for the reform of the Indian Constitution, which were embodied in the White Paper, published in March, 1933. The White Paper was examined by a Joint Committee of both the Houses of Parliament, presided over by Lord Linlithgow, Viceroy of India since 1936, with the help of Indian assessors. The Committee approved of the proposals of the White Paper subject to certain modifications and presented its report in October, 1934. A Bill, prepared on the report of this Committee, known as the Government of India Bill, 1935, was introduced in Parliament and became an Act on 2nd August, 1935, with slight alterations.

The Act of 1935 embodied two main principles—(1) an All-India Federation, comprising Governors' Provinces, Chief Commissioners' Provinces, and the Federating Indian States, and (2) Provincial Autonomy, with a Government responsible to an elected Legislature in every Governor's Province. All functions hitherto exercised by the Secretary of State, the

Government of India and the Provinces were resumed by the Crown, which redistributed them between the Central Government on the one hand and the Provinces on the other. As regards the Indian States, the functions and powers of paramountcy were to be exercised henceforth not by the Government of India but by " His Majesty's Representative for the exercise of those functions of the Crown ". Normally, though not necessarily, this office was to be held by the Governor-General, but as His Majesty's representative and not as the head of the Federal Government. Further, certain important departments like foreign affairs, ecclesiastical affairs and defence, being excluded from the control of the Indian Legislature, were to be administered by the Governor-General under the superintendence and direction of Whitehall alone; and the Governor-General and the Governors of Provinces were invested with special powers, in respect of functions transferred to the control of Ministers, for which they had responsibility to the British Parliament. Thus the consitutional status of India, even under the new Act, was that of a dependency, though it was " gradually gravitating towards that of a Dominion ".

The States being " independent " entities could not be compelled to enter the Federation. Each State willing to join it was required to execute through its ruler an Instrument of Accession, which must be accepted by the Crown before it became a member of the Federation. The Federation was to be proclaimed by His Majesty when two conditions were satisfied: (1) an address in that behalf must be presented to the King by each House of Parliament, and (2) States which were entitled to choose not less than fifty-two members in the upper house of the Federal Legislature, and whose population was not less than one-half of the total population of the States must accede to it.

As this portion of the Act dealing with the Federation was never actually brought into operation, we need not discuss it in detail and will only briefly describe its provisions. The Act provided for a " Federal Executive " of a diarchical nature consisting of two parts. One of these, in charge of " transferred departments ", was to be responsible to the Legislature; and the other, dealing with specifically reserved departments like Foreign Affairs, Defence, etc., was to remain under the sole charge of the Governor-General, who was in these matters responsible only to the British Parliament. Even in those subjects which were to be handed over to the Ministers, the Governor-General was given special powers and responsibilities, and discretion to act on his own authority.

The Federal Legislature was to be a bicameral body consisting of a " Lower Chamber ", known as the House of Assembly or the Federal Assembly, and an " Upper Chamber ", known as the Council of State. The Lower Chamber was to consist of 250 representatives of British India and not more than 125 of the Indian States. The members of the Federal Assembly were to be elected not by popular constituencies, but by the

legislative Assemblies of the Provinces. Even in this indirect form of election, the General (Hindu), Muslim and Sikh seats were to be filled by the representatives of these communities in the Provincial Assemblies, voting separately for a prescribed number of seats for each community. The Council of State, or the Upper Chamber, was to consist of 156 members for British India and not more than 104 for the federating States. The State members were to be appointed by their respective rulers. Of the members for British India, six were to be nominated by the Governor-General so as to secure the due representation of the minority communities, depressed classes, and women, and the rest were to be directly, in a few cases indirectly, elected on a high franchise by communal electorates. The tenure of life of the Federal Assembly was to be for five years, but the Governor-General could dissolve it earlier at his discretion. The Council of State was to be a permanent body not subject to dissolution. The term of each member was not to exceed nine years, and one-third of the total number of members were to retire every three years. Barring some minor details, both the Chambers were to have co-ordinate powers in almost all respects, even in financial matters.

The character and shape of the Provincial Government were changed considerably by the Act of 1935. It made provision for redistribution of the Provinces, and two new Provinces were created—Sind, separated from the Bombay Presidency, and Orissa, comprising a portion of the territory of the old Province of Bihār and Orissa, part of the Central Provinces, and certain areas of the Madras Presidency, inhabited by the Oriyās. Burma was separated from British India, and Aden also ceased to be a part of India. In all, there were no eleven Governors' Provinces and six Chief Commissioners' Provinces. The Chief Commissioners' Provinces were administered by the Governor-General through a Chief Commissioner appointed by him according to his discretion.

In the Governors' Provinces, diarchy was abolished and Provincial Autonomy introduced. The Act vested the executive authority of a Province in the Governor himself as the representative of the Crown. He was provided with a Council of Ministers to aid and advise him in the discharge of the functions conferred on him by the Act, in the entire sphere of provincial government, except in certain matters like law and order, etc., for which he had special responsibilities and which were in his sole discretion. The Ministers were to be appointed by the Governor normally from amongst the members of the local Legislature[1] and were to be responsible to it. In constituting the Ministry, the Governor was to pay due regard to the interests of minorities. The salaries of the Ministers would not vary during their term of office.

1 Under the Act of 1919 the Ministers were recruited from among the elected members of the Legislature. But according to the Act of 1935 a nominated member of the Upper Chamber of the Legislature might be appointed a Minister.

The Provincial Legislature consisted of the Governor as His Majesty's Representative, and one or two chambers. Madras, Bombay, Bengal, the United Provinces, Bihār and Assam, had each two chambers known as the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly; the rest of the Provinces the Punjab, the Central Provinces and Berar, the North-West Frontier Province, Orissa and Sind, had each a single chamber known as the Legislative Assembly. The strength of the Legislative Assembly, or the lower chamber, varied from 50 to 250 members, all elected; and it was to sit for five years, though it might be dissolved earlier by the Governor. The electorate in every Province for choosing representatives of the Legislature was formed on the basis of communities and interests, according to the terms of the Communal Award of 4th August, 1932, as modified by the Poona Pact of 25th September, 1932. Besides representatives of special electorates, certain seats out of the general ones were reserved for the "scheduled castes", that is, the so-called depressed classes. About 10 per cent of the total population of India was enfranchised by this Act, and women were given a wider franchise than was provided by the Act of 1919. The Legislative Council, or the upper chamber, was a permanent body not subject to dissolution, but as near as might be one-third of its members were to retire every third year. It was formed on the same communal basis of the Legislative Assembly. The powers of the two Chambers were co-ordinate, except in the matter of voting certain grants to the Government and introducing financial bills, which were within the purview of the Legislative Assembly. If there were a difference of opinion between the two Chambers in regard to a Bill, the Governor had the power to convoke a joint session of the two Chambers and to form a decision according to the opinion of the majority of members of the joint meeting.

The Governor was invested with some extraordinary powers. Under certain conditions, he could refuse his assent to Bills passed by the Legislature. He had the power to promulgate ordinances if, when the Legislature was not in session, he thought that circumstances rendered it necessary for him to take immediate action, and also to issue ordinances at any time with regard to certain subjects. These ordinances had the same force and effect as an Act of the Provincial Legislature during the prescribed period. Further, under certain conditions, the Governor could issue permanent Acts, known as Governor's Acts, either forthwith or after consulting the Legislature if it so pleased him. Again, in case of the failure of the constitutional machinery, the Governor might by proclamation "declare that his functions shall, to such extent as may be specified in the Proclamation, be exercised by him in his discretion". Governor exercised these powers under the direction and control of the Governor-General and the British Parliament. Thus though the Act of 1935 had given autonomy to the Provinces in a large sphere of public administration, the special powers of the Governor were regarded as limitations on real responsible

government. The constitutional provisions regarding the Provincial Governments came into force on 1st April, 1937. In July, 1937, the Congress formed Ministries in the majority of the Governors' Provinces and remained in office till the closing months of 1939.

3. The Indian States

The constitutional problem of India continued to be very much complicated by the existence of the States as an outstanding feature in Indian political life. British paramountcy over the States was clearly asserted by Lord Curzon, Lord Minto (II) and Lord Hardinge (II), though in view of the disturbed political situation in India after the Bengal Partition agitation and the difficulties of the 1914–1918 War respectively, Lord Minto (II) and Lord Hardinge (II) adopted a more conciliatory attitude towards the States and tried to secure greater co-operation from them. When investing the Mahārājā of Jodhpur with ruling powers on 26th February, 1916, Lord Hardinge (II) described the Indian princes as " helplers and colleagues in the great task of imperial rule ".

Later this policy was manifested in two ways. One was the development of the Imperial Service Troops (maintained by the States and trained by British officers), which had their beginnings in the days of Lord Dufferin (1884–1888) and rendered valuable services to the cause of the British Empire, especially during the First World War. The other was the growth of a consultative body composed of representatives of different states. Attempts to constitute such a body had been made before by Lord Lytton, Lord Curzon, Lord Minto (II) and Lord Hardinge (II) and its importance was further realised by Lord Chelmsford after the First World War. The Montagu-Chelmsford Report made a definite recommendation for such a body, and accordingly the Chamber of Princes was set up by the Crown by a Royal Proclamation on 8th February, 1921. The Chamber of Princes was a consultative and not an executive body, consisting of representatives of different classes of States, with the Viceroy as its President and a Chancellor and a Pro-Chancellor elected annually from among the members. The Viceroy could consult its Standing Committee freely in matters relating to the territories of the Indian States generally on those problems which concerned British India and the States in common. The Chamber, however, could not deal with the internal affairs of Indian States or their rulers, or their relations with the Crown, or interfere in any way with the existing rights or engagements of the States or restrict their freedom of action.

At the same time, the growth of paramountcy and the right claimed to interfere in the internal affairs of the States were not to the liking of the rulers of the States, who became more touchy on this point owing to the gradual Indianisation of the Government of India. They also began to

demand a share in the formulation of the tariff policy and the collection of the customs revenue. So in December, 1927, the Secretary of State appointed the Indian States Committee, popularly known as the Butler Committee, after the name of its Chairman, Sir Harcourt Butler,[1] to investigate the relationship between the Paramount Power and the Indian States and to make recommendations for the adjustment of economic and financial relations between British India and the Indian States. The Committee reported early in 1929 and along with several recommendations recorded its strong opinion " that, in view of the historical nature of the relationship between the Paramount Power and the Princes, the latter should not be transferred without their own agreement to a relationship with a new Government in India responsible to an Indian legislature ". The recommendations of the Committee were criticised on the ground that they were not in consonance with the spirit of the times and did not make the relation between the two halves of India " harmonious and satisfactory ".

But sober opinion on both sides soon realised the necessity of a closer association between the Indian States and British India in a federation, as both were intimately interrelated in various ways. The Nehru Committee in 1928 and the Indian Statutory Commission emphasised this point. We have already noted how the Government of India Act, 1935, provided for the accession of the States to the proposed Federation.

[1]Formerly Governor in succession of the United Provinces and of Burma, and previously a member of the Governor-General's Council.

CHAPTER VII

INTERNAL ADMINISTRATION AND GENERAL CONDITION, 1906–1938

1. General Review

THE political agitation which followed upon the Partition of Bengal by Lord Curzon gradually assumed a revolutionary character. Apart from the growth of a radical section in the Congress, and the movement for boycotting foreign goods by way of protest against the Partition, secret societies grew up in various parts of India with the avowed object of collecting arms and manufacturing bombs to do away with certain types of officials and, if possible, to organise an armed insurrection. There was a " general state of serious unrest " not only in Bengal but even in distant Provinces like the Punjab and Madras, and Government adopted strong measures. Laws were passed which put severe restrictions on popular movements as well as on the Press and public meetings. Some of the leading figures were deported without trial. Others were hanged or transported for life, and a large number, including notable leaders like Tilak, were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. But even these severe measures could not check the murders and outrages, and ultimately the Government decided to modify Lord Curzon's measure. The despatch of the Government of India on the subject, dated the 25th August, 1911, testified to the bitterness of feeling engendered by the Partition. It also frankly recognised the " substantial grievance " of the Bengalis " who found themselves outnumbered in the legislatures of both the Provinces of Bengal and Eastern Bengal ", and the " growing estrangement, which had assumed a very serious character in many parts of the country, between Mahommedans and Hindus."

The accession of King George V was followed by a *Durbar* in Delhi held by the King and Queen in person in December, 1911. His Majesty made two famous announcements in the *Durbar*. One was the creation of the Presidency of Bengal under a Governor. Bihār, Orissa and Chota Nāgpur were separated from it and formed into a Province under a Lieutenant-Governor, while Assam was restored as a Chief-Commissionership. (Both were subsequently placed under Governors.) The other was the transfer of the capital of India from Calcutta to Delhi. The Viceroy, Lord Hardinge, was severely criticised for recommending these measures, but time to a large extent justified his policy. Although terrorist outrages were not

DELHI DURBAR 1911

stamped out altogether, there was a considerable improvement in the general situation, and feelings against the British grew much less bitter.

This was abundantly demonstrated in less than three years' time, for the outbreak of the World War in 1914 put the loyalty of India to a stern test, and she acquitted herself in a way which won her the gratitude of Britain and the admiration of the world. Her people and Princes ungrudgingly placed their resources at the disposal of the Government, and Indian soldiers fought with bravery and won distinction in various theatres of war in Europe, Africa and Western Asia. Even in the first few months of the war nearly 300,000 were sent overseas to fight on different fronts, and India supplied England with "70,000,000 rounds of small arms ammunition, 60,000 rifles of the latest type, and more than 550 guns." During the course of the war more than 800,000 combatants and 400,000 non-combatants were recruited on a voluntary basis. India's contribution in material was also almost equally important. Apart from munitions, her cotton, jute, iron, steel, wolfram, manganese, mica, saltpetre, rubber, skins, petroleum, tea and wheat, were of great help to the Allies. India also made financial contributions to her utmost capacity. Although her troops were employed outside her borders, she paid the normal expenditure for their maintenance, which varied between 20 and 30 million pounds sterling per annum. She also paid the cost of an additional force of 300,000 men and made a free gift of £100,000,000 sterling to the British Government. These heavy payments involved India in currency difficulties of a serious nature for many years.

England fully recognised the generous services of India. Apart from the constitutional changes of 1919, described above, Indians were admitted to the War Cabinet and the Imperial Conference. Mr. S.P. Sinha was made a peer and appointed Under-Secretary of State for India. Indians were admitted to King's Commissions in the army. A Territorial Force and a University Training Corps were organised. When the League of Nations was established India became one of its foundation members.

2. Local Self-Government

Whatever might have been the intentions of Lord Ripon, reforms in the sphere of local self-government did not make it free from official control, and, as the Indian Statutory Commission observed in 1929, "no real attempt was made to inaugurate a system amenable to the will of the local inhabitants". These defects were clearly recognised by the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, and Lord Chelmsford's Government issued a Resolution on 16th May, 1918, declaring the "policy of the gradual removal of unnecessary Government control and of differentiating the spheres of action appropriate for Government and for local bodies respectively".

It was proposed to make these bodies as representative as possible, to remove unnecessary restrictions regarding taxation, the budget and the sanction of works, to bring the franchise as low as possible and to replace nominated Chairmen by elected non-officials. This Resolution also emphasised the importance of developing the corporate life of the village.

In 1921 local self-government became a Transferred subject in charge of Ministers. The Municipalities and Local Boards were vested with enhanced powers and functions, were freed comparatively from official control, became responsible to an enlarged electorate, and came to have elected Chairmen except under extraordinary conditions when expert guidance became necessary. The Provincial Governments began to evince great zeal and interest for the progress of local institutions, and passed several Acts modifying their nature in the cities and the villages to suit modern conditions. It is of course true that the local bodies have not worked satisfactorily in all cases. But this is not because the people are incapable of self-government, but is, as the Central Committee rightly pointed out, " the inevitable result of the suddenness with which the transition from official tutelage to complete freedom was made ".

One notable feature of local self-government in modern times is the institution of Improvement Trusts in important cities like Bombay, Calcutta, Lucknow, Allahābād, Cawnpore and Rangoon, which have undertaken important activities to improve local sanitation.

3. The Public Services

During the early years of the twentieth century Indians continued to agitate for a greater share in the Publi Services. In September, 1912, a Royal Commission on the Public Services in India was appointed, with Lord Islington as Chairman. Among the members of the Commission were the late Mr. G.K. Gokhale, Lord Ronaldshay (later Lord Zetland), Sir Valentine Chirol, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, Mr. Herbert Fisher, later Warden of New College, Oxford, and Sir ' Abdur Rahim. Owing to the outbreak of the First World War, the publication of this Commission's report was deferred till 1917. It recommended that besides the recruitment of Indians to the I.C.S. through the London examination, 25 per cent of the posts in the Superior Civil Service should be filled from among Indians partly by direct recruitment and partly by promotion from the lower service. To make the working of this scheme possible, it also recommended the holding of an examination in India for the recruitment of civilians, thus conceding to the Indians in a changed form what they had been demanding for more than half a century.

The authors of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report took a more liberal and sympathetic view than the Islington Commission on the question of

Indianising the Indian Civil Service. They proposed that (I) " 33 per cent of the superior posts should be recruited for in India, and that this percentage should be increased by 1½ per cent annually " until the situation was revised by a Commission; (2) that all racial distinctions in the matter of appointments should be abolished; and (3) that " for all the Public Services, for which there is recruitment in England open to Europeans and Indians alike, there must be a system of appointment in India ". For about four years, the principle laid down in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report was followed in the matter of recruiting Indians. But the members of the Superior Services became rather perturbed at the growing Indianisation of the Services. Accordingly, pursuant to the recommendation of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, the Secretary of State in Council introduced a scheme under which All-India officers, selected for appointment before 1st January, 1920, and not permanently employed under the Government of India, were allowed to retire, before the completion of the normal period of service, on a pension proportionate to their length of service.

But certain difficulties regarding the Services continued, for the solution of which a Royal Commission was appointed in June, 1923, with Lord Lee of Fareham as its Chairman. The Lee Commission submitted its report in 1924 and most of its recommendations were accepted and put into force by the Government. The Commission recommended that All-India officers of the Indian Civil Service, the Indian Police Service, the Irrigation Branch of the Service of Engineers and the Indian Forest Service should continue to be appointed and controlled by the Secretary of State in Council, while the services in the Transferred departments should be controlled by Provincial Governments, excepting the Indian Medical Service, for which each Province was to appoint in its civil medical department a certain number of officers lent by the Medical Department of the Army in India. As regards Indiansiation of Services which were still to be controlled by the Secretary of State, the Commission recommended that 20 per cent of the officers should be recruited by promotion from Provincial Civil Services, and of the remaining 80 per cent half should be British and half Indian. It calculated that by following this principle there would be in 1939 equal numbers of Europeans and Indians in the Superior Civil Service posts. But this calculation was wrong, and the Simon Commission pointed out that the number of Indians in Superior Civil Service posts was likely to be 643 as against 715 Europeans on 1st January, 1939. As provided by the Government of India Act, 1919, the Lee Commission recommended the immediate establishment of a Public Service Commission. Such a Commission, composed of five whole-time members, was appointed in 1925. Further, after 1922 certain officers in the Indian Civil Service were recruited on the result of a competitive examination held every year in India.

Part X of the Government of India Act, 1935, defined the rights and status of the civil and military officers in the Provinces and the proposed Federation

and guaranteed their existing privileges regarding pay, promotion, leave, pension, etc. It also provided for the establishment of a Federal Public Service Commission and Provincial Public Service Commissions; but two or more Provinces might "agree that one Commission shall serve a group or that all the Provinces shall use one Commission". The functions of the Commissions were purely advisory. They could only recommend names, which the Ministers, at least in some cases, might accept or reject.

4. The Judiciary

The year 1861 saw the establishment of High Courts in Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, in which were amalgamated the previously existing Supreme Courts and Sadar Courts. At least one-third of the judges of the High courts were to be recruited from Her Majesty's Civil Service in India, another one-third from among barristers of England or advocates of Scotland, and the rest might be recruited from among the pleaders of the High courts or the officers of the subordinate judiciary. The Chief Justices of the High Courts were to be appointed from among the barristers of England or advocates of Scotland. On the strength of the Indian High Courts Act of 1911, High Courts were established at Patna, Lahore and Rangoon. The elimination of the Civilian element from the bench had been demanded by Indian public opinion. But the arrangement provided by the Government of India Act, 1935, did not satisfy this demand. It abolished the old proportional arrangement and laid down that judges would be appointed, according to convenience, from these three classes but "not necessarily in the old proportion" and thus held out greater advantages in this respect for members of the Indian Civil Service than what existed before. Further, the old rule of appointing the Chief Justices exclusively from among barristers or advocates was modified to the extent that they now might be recruited either from among the pleaders of High courts or from among the officers of the Indian Civil Service.

Another change in the Judiciary was necessitated by the proposed Federaration. Sections 200 and 203 of the Government of India Act, 1935, provided for the creation of a Federal Court, which was normally to be located at Delhi and was to consist of a Chief Justice and not more than six puisne judges. The judges were to be appointed by the Crown and were to hold office till the age of sixty-five. The Federal Court was to have original jurisdiction in cases of constitutional disputes between one Province and another, between a Province and a federated State, and between a Province and the Federal authorities. It would also hear appeals from the High Courts provided the latter certified that the cases related to a fundamental question of law regarding the interpretation of the Government of India Act or any Order in Council made under it.

The Federal Court was constituted on October 1, 1937.

5. Police and Jails

The Police system established by the Police Act of 1861 revealed grave defects in actual working, chiefly because the responsible task of maintaining law and order was entrusted to rather untrained and consequently irresponsible persons. A Police Commission was appointed in 1902 to investigate the state of police administration. The Commission made comprehensive recommendations regarding different aspects of police organisation, which were accepted in the main by the Government with some minor modifications in matters of detail. This Commission created specialised police agencies, known as Criminal Investigation Departments, in each Province for the investigation of "specialist and professional" crimes. Also a Central Intelligence Bureau under the Home Department of the Government of India was formed to collect information from all provincial Criminal Investigation Departments, and to work for interprovincial liaison.

Strictly speaking, no Indian or All-India police was created. The police established by the Act of 1861 became an essentially provincial organisation, administered by the Local Government concerned, and not subject to the general control of the Central Government. At the head of the police organisation in each Province was placed an Inspector-General of Police with general control over it. Deputy Inspector-Generals were given subordinate charges of portions of the Province. At the head of each district was appointed a District Superintendent of Police, having under him Inspectors of Police, Sub-Inspectors and Constables in subordinate charges called sub-divisions and *thānās*. In villages provision was made for *chowkidārs* or watchmen, who were not to get stipends but were to receive perquisites from the residents of the village, or rent-free lands, or small sums of money from the Government. In the Presidency towns like Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, was stationed a unified police force under the Police Commissioner, acting not under the provincial Inspector-General but dealing directly with the Government and responsible for law and order and for departmental training and efficiency.

There is no doubt that the police organisation still requires thorough-going reforms. One thing essentially needed is that the "morale and intelligence" of the police officers shall be improved so that they may exercise their authority with more discretion. The recruitment of a number of literate police constables, during recent years, and employment of Home Guards for local watch and ward, are encouraging features.

Jail administration in India came to be regulated in modern times by the Indian Prisons Act of 1894 and by rules issued under it by the Government of India and the Provincial Governments. Three types of jails were established —Central, District and Subsidiary. In each Province the Jail Department was placed under the control of an Inspector-General of Prisons, who was generally to be a member of the Indian Medical Service with jail experience.

The Central Jails were under Superintendents, who also came to be recruited from the same Service and to be assisted in large Central Jails by Deputy Superintendents. A District Jail came under the charge of a Civil Surgeon, with subordinate staff composed of jailors, deputy and assistant jailors, and warders. Many big cities were provided with Reformatory Schools adminstered since 1899 by the Education Department.

The Government of India appointed a Jails Committee in 1919 with a view to reforming jail administration. This committee made a comprehensive survey of Indian prison administration and emphasised "the necessity of improving and increasing existing jail accommodation; of recruiting a better class of warders; of providing education for prisoners; and of developing prison industries so as to meet the needs of the consuming Departments of Governments". It also recommended the separation of Civil from Criminal offenders and the creation of Children's Courts, and drew particular attention to the reformative side of the system. The Provincial Governments have tried to carry out these recommendations more or less.

Under the Government of India Act, 1919, the maintenance of prisons fell within the sphere of Provincial Governments, subject, however, to all-India legislation. With the introduction of Provincial Autonomy from 1st April, 1937, jail administration became a Provincial subject and the power of legislation in this respect was vested in the Provincial Governments, the Central Government exercising only concurrent law-making powers with the Provincial Governments as regards the transfer of prisoners and criminals from one unit to another.

6. The Military System and Defence

During the viceroyalty of Lord Curzon, a significant change took place in the Army administration. Till then the Commander-in-Chief was an Extraordinary Member of the Governor-General's Executive Council. But there was also on this body a Military Member as the "constitutional adviser of the Viceroy on all questions relating to the Army". The Commander-in-Chief had to introduce his proposals and schemes before the Council through the Military Member, who was an officer of lower rank than himself. Lord Kitchener, Commander-in-Chief of India since November, 1902, condemned this system as a "military solecism involving, moreover, great expense and delay". He advocated the abolition of the Military Member, and sought to make the Commander-in-Chief the sole military adviser to the Government of India. But Lord Curzon opposed it on the ground that the military must be held subordinate to the civil power. This controversy led to the resignation of the Viceroy in August, 1905. The British Cabinet decided in favour of Lord Kitchener and made a compromise which, however, proved unworkable within a short period and was consequently abrogated. After

1909 the Commander-in-Chief was the sole military adviser of the Government of India, but in the opinion of many publicists Lord Curzon's standpoint was reasonable and just. The next higher authority, above the Commander-in-Chief, in military administration was the Governor-General-in-Council, who had to pay due regard to all orders received from the Secretary of State in regard to the Defence Administration in India. The Secretary of State, as one of His Majesty's Ministers, had special responsibility and authority in this matter.

The problem of Indian defence has been one of the burning topics of modern Indian politics. With the progress of the Nationalist Movement in India, her people demanded a definite control over the defence administration, and political leaders insistently complained against the heavy Army expenditure, which, in their opinion, should be diverted to "nation-building" activities. The Montagu-Chelmsford Report, after praising the brilliant and faithful services of the Indian Army during the First World War, emphasised "the necessity of grappling with the problem" of Indianising it further. The Nehru Report advocated the transfer of control over the Indian Army to the Ministers. The Skeen Committee, appointed in June, 1925, with Major-General (afterwards General) Sir Andrew Skeen, the then Chief-of-Staff of the Army in India, as Chairman, and commonly known as the "Indian Sandhurst Committee", recommended the abolition of the "eight units scheme", which had been announced in 1923 by Lord Rawlinson, the then Commander-in-Chief in India, and the establishment of an Indian "Sandhurst" by 1933. These recommendations were not fully carried out. The Indian Statutory Commission considered the "cardinal problem" of national defence from different points of view, and insisted on the presence of the British element in the Indian Army on three considerations—frontier defence, internal security and obligations to the Indian States. It observed that "the control of an Army including a British element cannot be made over to an Indian Legislature" and that "the evolution of an entirely Indian military force capable of undertaking unaided the tasks now discharged by the Army in India, must be a very slow process indeed". No "substantial change" was made in the matter of India's defence by the Government of India Act, 1935.

As regards the organisation of the Army, we may note that the Command system introduced by Lord Kitchener in 1904 was abolished by him in 1907, when the Indian Army was divided into two sections, the Northern and the Southern. The war of 1914–18, during which Indian troops of all descriptions rendered valuable services, showed the defects of this system, and it was reorganised after the war was over. The Indian territory was divided into four commands, subdivided into fourteen districts, each district containing a certain number of brigade commands. One of these, the Western Command, was abolished on 1st November, 1938.

The defence forces of India consisted in 1939 of the Regular Army, includ-

ing units from the Britsh Army; the Auxiliary Force, the membership of which was limited to European British subjects; the Territorial Force, composed of three main categories, provincial battalions, urban units and the University Training Corps Units; the Royal Air Force from October, 1932; and the Royal Indian Marine, designated as the Royal Indian Navy from October, 1934. There were also the Indian State Forces, formerly known as the Imperial Service Troops, raised and maintained by the rulers of States at their own cost and for State service.

There were two main categories of officers in the Indian Army, those holding the King's Commission and those holding the Viceroy's Commission. The latter were all Indians having a limited status and power of command. As for the King's Commission, Indians had been eligible for it since 1918 in three ways (*a*) by qualifying themselves as cadets at the Royal Military College at Sandhurst, and the Indian Military Academy at Dehra Dun (opened in October, 1932) (*b*) by the selection of efficient Indian officers or promotion of non-commissioned officers of regiments from the ranks, and (*c*) by the award of honorary King's Commissions to officers who cannot qualify themselves for these on account of their advanced age or lack of education. In 1932 the Government announced its intention of Indianisng a Division of all Arms and a Cavalry Brigade. Another important stage in the Indianisation of the Indian Army was marked by the passing of the Indian Army (Amendment) Act by the Central Legislature during its autumn session of 1934. According to this measure, officers commissioned from the Indian Military Academy would enjoy legal status and would be designated as "Indian Commissioned officers".

Important steps were taken during succeeding years to bring the equipment and organisation of the defence forces of India into line with modern conditions. In September, 1939, the recommendations of the Chatfield Committee were published. Provision was made for a gift of thirty-three and a half crores by the United Kingdom for bringing about the desired reforms, and a loan of eleven and three-quarter crores free of interest was also provided for. The establishment of British troops was to be reduced by about 25 per cent. The Army was to be distributed on the following basis, namely, frontier defence, internal security, coast defence and general reserve. Provision was also made for light tanks and armoured cars and for motor transport. Artillery regiments were to be mechanised and better equipped with guns. The Air Force was to be provided with bomber squadrons, flights for coast defence and for co-operation with the army. The Royal Indian Navy was to be strengthened by vessels of the newest type. Ordnance factories were to be reconstructed and expanded.

7. Financial Administration

To Lord Mayo's Government belongs the credit for taking the first important step towards financial decentralisation in India by giving to each Provincial Government a fixed grant for the maintenance of certain definite services, such as police, jails, education and the medical services, with powers, under certain financial rules, to allocate the revenues assigned to them at their discretion and to provide for extra expenditure by economising, or, if necessary, by raising local taxes. The next significant step in this direction was taken in 1877 during the Viceroyalty of Lord Lytton, when, as we have already noted, certain important heads of revenue were provincialised, while the responsibility of Provinces as regards expenditure was extended to the departments of land revenue, general administration, and law and justice. Settlements on these lines were made in 1882 and 1897 with, however, no change of principle in any case.

A departure was made in 1904 with the introduction of " the system of quasi-permanent settlements" under which assignments of revenues made to Provincial Governments were definitely fixed and were not subject to change by the Central Government except under extraordinary circumstances. Something more was gained by the Provinces a little later by the introduction of the famine insurance scheme, according to which a fixed amount was placed by the Government of India to the credit of each Provincial Government, which the latter could utilise in case of famine without touching its normal resources. In 1917 the famine relief expenditure was made a divided head, the expenses being borne by the Central and Provincial Governments in the proportion of three to one.

No radical change in financial relations between the Centre and the Provinces was proposed by the Royal Commission on Decentralisation in India appointed in 1908. But in 1912 Lord Hardinge's Government made the financial settlements permanent, reduced the fixed provincial assignments and increased the share of the Provinces in the growing revenues. The restrictions on the financial powers of the Provincial Governments were still very stringent. The Montagu-Chelmsford Report pointed out how seriously the existing financial arrangements operated " as an obstacle to provincial enfranchisement" and suggested a wider degree of financial devolution. Accordingly a Committee, known as the Financial Relations Committee, was appointed, with Lord Meston, who had been Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces and the Finance Member of the Governor-General's Executive Council, as Chairman. The scheme set up according to the recommendations of this Committee, with slight modifications made by the Joint Select Committee of Parliament, is known as the Meston Award. It avoided, as far as possible, divided heads of revenue. To make the financial relations between the Central and Provincial Governments clear and definite, certain sources of income, such as Land Revenue, Excise,

Irrigation, Forests, Judicial Stamps and Registration Fees and Minerals, were made Provincial, while sources like Customs Duty, Income Tax, Railway Revenues, Posts and Telegraphs, Salt and Opium were reserved for the Central Government. Total abolition of the divided heads was not possible and it was laid down that the Provinces should receive some share in the increase of revenue from income tax. The contributions to be made by the Provincial Governments to meet the Central deficit, varying in amount, were also fixed, their total being a little less than ten crores of rupees. The Province of Bihār and Orissa was not required to make any contribution at all. The Provinces protested against these contributions, which, being consequently reduced in amount in successive stages, finally disappeared from the Budget in 1928–1929.

With the beginning of attempts for the introduction of the proposed Federal Constitution, the important question of the distribution of revenues between the Central Government and the Provincial Governments was considered by the India Statutory Commission (Layton Report), by a sub-committee of the Federal Structure Committee under the chairmanship of Lord Peel, and by a Federal Finance Committee with Lord Eustace Percy as its Chairman. The Government of India Act, 1935, provided a composite financial arrangement, based on the findings of the above-mentioned bodies. A classification was made of the sources of revenue as Federal and Provincial in separate lists. The following taxes were to be levied and collected by the Federal Government: (*i*) Duties in respect of succession to property other than agricultural land, (*ii*) Stamp duties in respect of bills of exchange, cheques, promissory notes, bills of lading, letters of credit, policies of insurance, proxies and receipts, (*iii*) Terminal taxes on goods or passengers carried by railway and air, (*iv*) Taxes on railway fares and freights, (*v*) Taxes on income, excluding corporation taxes (that is, a tax on the profits of companies), (*vi*) Salt excise and export duties.

The net proceeds of some of these duties and taxes, such as the income tax, duties on jute export, etc., were to be distributed, under certain conditions, among the Provinces and the Federal States within which these had been collected. The Federal Legislature was, however, competent to levy a surcharge on these duties and taxes and to appropriate the proceeds for Federal purposes. The Secretary of State appointed a financial expert, Sir Otto Niemeyer, to determine the terms of the financial settlement between the Central and Provincial Governments. His report, published in April, 1936, was accepted and its main recommendations were: (*i*) To enable all the Provinces to possess adequate financial resources on the inauguration of the new Constitution on 1st April, 1937, certain Provinces to be given cash subventions, (*ii*) some Provinces should be granted relief in the form of cancellation of debts incurred prior to 1st April, 1936, (*iii*) twelve and a half per cent of the jute tax should be distributed among the jute-growing Provinces, and (*iv*) subject to certain conditions, half of the income tax should be assigned to the Provinces

beginning from five years after the inauguration of Provincial Autonomy. This scheme did not satisfactorily solve the fundamental problem of Indian finance by giving adequate funds to the Provinces for their relief or added strength. In order to secure financial stability, the Reserve Bank Act. was passed in 1934 and the Bank began operations in 1935.

Land revenue is the main source of revenue of the Provinces. It is partly in the nature of a rent and partly a tax. In recent times attempts had been made to bring it under the effective control of the Legislature, and with the inauguration of Provincial Autonomy the new Legislatures in the Provinces paid much attention towards revising land revenue administration. The Socialists demanded the abolition of the Zamindāri system, and some new Governments in the Provinces also want to enforce it.

8. Communications and Public Works

A. Railways

Under the new Guarantee System (1879–1900), most of the railways were acquired or purchased by the State on the expiry of the respective periods of contract with the companies concerned. But the management was left to the companies, subject to Government control, exercised through the Railway Board, which was created in 1905. The fourteen years before the First World War were marked by a rapid extension of railways and a beginning of railway profits. But during the period 1914-1921, there was a setback, partly due to wartime pressure on them and partly due to the decrease of the annual programme of capital expenditure.

After the introduction of the reforms of 1919, a Committee was appointed, with the late Sir William Acworth as its Chirman, to investigate into the working of the railways and recommend a suitable policy for their further development. The Committee recommended an expenditure of 150 crores of rupees every five years on improving the railways; and its majority report definitely favoured State management of the railways and construction of new lines by State agency. The Committee also recommended the creation of a new department of communications, reorganisation of railway boards, establishment of a Railway Rates Tribunal, and separation of the railway budget from the general budget. It should be noted that Indian public opinion has always been opposed to company management of railways, not only because their profits thereby went out of India but also because the companies were considered to be unsympathetic towards Indian national interests. Though the Government of India did not definitely accept the recommendation of the majority report regarding the ending of company management, yet under the pressure of Indian opinion it ultimately took under its direct management the East Indian Railway (1st January, 1925), the Great Indian Peninsular

Railway (30th June, 1925), the Burma Railways (1st January, 1929) and the Southern Punjab Railway (1st January, 1930). The Government began to undertake all new construction of railways. The Railway Board was also reorganised. As constituted in 1936, it had the Chief Commissioner as President, the Financial Commissioner and three other members. The Rates Advisory Committee was created in 1926, and the Central Publicity Bureau of the Railway Board was started on 1st April, 1927. In accordance with the recommendation of the Acworth Committee, railway finance was separated from the general Budget from 1925.

B. Roads

Progressive decentralisation, and the growth of local self-government, have afforded considerable stimulus to road development. More attention has also been recently paid to the need for co-ordination of rail-road transport, and this question was discussed in 1933 by a specially convened Road-Rail Conference at Simla. A special Road Development Committee was appointed in 1927 to consider the road problems of India. In accordance with its recommendations, the import and excise duties on motor spirit were increased from four to six annas per gallon in March, 1929, the additional duty being earmarked for expenditure on road development; the Standing Committee of the Indian Legislature on Roads was created in the following April; and the All-India Road Conferences began to be convened from time to time.

C. Water Transport

The importance of Water Transport has decreased in modern times, owing to the construction of railways. The water transport of India falls into two divisions: Inland water transport, facilitated by the river systems of Northern India, and Marine transport along India's extensive coastline. In 1918 the Industrial Commission emphasised the need of co-ordinating railway and waterway administrations in order to relieve railway congestion and meet the requirements of small-scale transport. For several reasons, the position of India's shipping and ship-building industries had become unsatisfactory. The need of developing an Indian Mercantile Marine was keenly felt, and, on the recommendation of the Marine Mercantile Committee (1923), the the Government provided a training ship, the I.M.M. *T.S. Dufferin*, for Indian cadets.

D. Irrigation

Irrigation works have a special importance in an agricultural country like India, where the rainfall is unequally distributed throughout the seasons and is

liable to failure or serious deficiency. The famines of 1896 and 1901 clearly showed the need and importance of protective irrigation works. Lord Curzon appointed a Commission on Irrigation in 1901, which submitted its report in 1903. A new chapter in the irrigation policy of the Government was open by the recommendations of this Commission. Among other things, it specially recommended the possible extension of the scope of productive, especially protective irrigation works for the Deccan districts of Bombay, Madras, the Central Provinces and Bundelkhand. It sketched out a rough programme of irrigation works for the next twenty years, adding 6½ million acres to the irrigated area at an estimated cost of £30,000,000.

There are three classes of irrigation works in India: (*i*) Wells, (*ii*) Tanks, and (*iii*) Canals. The canals are of three kinds: (*a*) Perennial canals, (*b*) Inundation canals, and (*c*) Storage works. Since 1921 irrigation works have been classified under two main heads: (*i*) Productive, and (*ii*) Unproductive, with a third class covering areas irrigated by non-capital works.

After the reforms of 1919, irrigation became a Provincial subject. The Provincial Governments have shown much activity regarding irrigation works, and the important measures that have been undertaken in this direction, are: (*i*) The Sutlej Valley project in the Punjab, completed in 1933, (*ii*) the Sukkur Barrage in Sind, completed in 1932, (*iii*) the Kāverī Reservoir and Mettur project, completed in 1934, (*iv*) the Nizāmasgar project, completed in 1934, (*v*) the Sarda-Oudh canals in the United Provinces, and (*vi*) the Lloyd Dam in Bombay, completed in 1926, which is one of the largest masses of masonry in the world.

9. Agriculture, Rural Indebtedness and Rural Reconstruction, and the Co-operative Movement

A. Agriculture

As a result of the recommendations of the Famine Commission of 1880, agricultural departments were started in the various Provinces. In 1901 an Inspector-General of Agriculture was appointed to advise the Imperial and Provincial Governments. This post was abolished in 1912, and its duties were transferred to the Director of the Agricultural Research Institute at Pusa, who was until 1929 Agricultural Adviser to the Government of India. The present Departments of Agriculture, however, owe their existence to Lord Curzon, whose famous despatch of 1903 marked the beginning of a reorganisation in 1905. The Pusa Institute was started in 1903, together with a college to provide for advanced agricultural training. An All-India Board of Agriculture was established in 1905 with a view to bringing the Provincial Governments more in touch with one another and making suitable recommendations to the Government of India. The Indian Agricultural



By courtesy of Indian Railways Bureau, 57 Haymarket, London

THE SUKKUR BARRAGE

Service was constituted in 1906. An agricultural college was founded at Poona in 1908 and similar colleges were started in subsequent years at Cawnpore, Nāgpur, Lyallpur, Coimbatore, and Māndālay.

With the introduction of the reforms of 1919, agriculture became a Transferred subject under a Minister, though the Government of India retained responsibility for central research institutions and for certain affairs relating to the diseases and pests of plants and animals. The Royal Commission on Agriculture (Linlithgow Commission) authoritatively reviewed the position of agriculture in India and reported in 1928. Having duly recognised the work done by the agricultural departments, the Commission stressed the enormous possibilities for future work and made comprehensive recommendations regarding the different problems of agriculture. On its recommendation, an important step was taken in July, 1929, by the establishment of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research, whose primary function was to promote, guide and co-ordinate agricultural, including veterinary, research in India and to extend help in these matters to the Provincial departments of agriculture. The Central Banking Enquiry Commttiee (1931) recommended that a Provincial Board of Economic Enquiry should be established in each Province to supply the Government with the information it requires to be able to pursue a constructive agricultural policy. Sir John Russell and R. Wright, who subsequently reviewed the progress of agricultural research work in India, made, in their report, important recommendations to bridge the gulf between the research worker and the cultivator. These were examined by a special Sub-Committee of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research. The Government of India declared their intention to extend further help to the agriculturists by providing better facilities for credit and for the marketing of agricultural produce. A central marketing section was started under the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research. It worked in collaboration with the marketing staff in the different Provinces.

B. Rural Indebtedness and Rural Reconstruction

Closely connected with agriculture is the serious problem of heavy rural indebtedness in modern India. As the Central Banking Enquiry Committee reported in 1931, the total agricultural indebtedness of the Provinces in British India was about 900 crores of rupees. The greater part of the rural debt, contracted at exorbitant rates of interest, is unproductive. The Government adopted certain measures, from time to time, to deal with this problem. The Usurious Loans Act, consolidated and amended in 1918, tried to determine the legal maximum amount of interest recoverable. The Royal Commission on Agriculture recommended regulation of money-lending, and some of the Provincial Banking Enquiry Committees recommended licensing of money-lenders. Land Alienation Acts were passed in order to restrict the transfer

of land. For example, the Punjab Land Alienation Act (1900) prohibited non-agricultural classes from buying land from agriculturists or taking land on mortgage for more than twenty years.

In recent times rural reconstruction claimed an increasing amount of attention both from the Government and the Congress. Mr. F.L. Brayne, I.C.S., tried, as Commissioner for Rural Reconstruction, an important experiment in rural uplift in the Gurgāon District of the Punjab. A similar appointment was made in Bengal. In the Central Provinces and Berar the local government carried on similar work from November, 1929. During the latter part of 1933 His Excellency Sir Frederick Sykes, the then Governor of Bombay, initiated a comprehensive scheme of village reconstruction, the work of which was carried on by District Committees under the guidance of the District Collectors. The Government of India also took an interest in the work of rural reconstruction and granted in 1935–1936 over two crores of rupees for this purpose. The Co-operative Movement in India also aims at solving the problem of rural indebtedness.

C. The Co-operative Movement

Frederick Nicholson, a Madras civilian, first suggested in his Report (1892) to the Madras Government the introduction of co-operative credit societies in India. In 1901 the Government of India appointed a Committee to consider the question of the establishment of agricultural banks in India, and after the Committee submitted its report, the Co-operative Credit Societies Act was passed by the Imperial Legislative Council in 1904. It provided for the starting of rural as well as urban credit societies. Thus the Co-operative Movement was inaugurated in India on 24th March, 1904. The movement showed remarkable progress in every Province within a few years. It received a fresh impetus by the Amending Act of 1912, which granted recognition to non-credit societies, central financing societies, and unions. The Maclagan Committee (1914–1915) made some valuable recommendations for the organisation of co-operative finance. After the reforms of 1919, co-operation became a Provincial subject and the local governments were left free to adapt the Act of 1912 to their own requirements. There are three parts in the financial structure of the Co-operative Movement: (*i*) The Agricultural Credit Society, (*ii*) Central Financing Agencies, and (*iii*) Provincial Co-operative Banks. The question of the relief of old debts of agriculturists, through long-term credit, led to the establishment of a special type of bank, known as the Land Mortgage Bank, in some Provinces.

But the Co-operative Movement passed through a very critical stage during recent years, owing partly to the fall of agricultural prices and general economic decline and partly to some defects in its working. In spite of all that has been done, the poverty and indebtedness of the Indian masses are

still appalling problems in Indian economic life, like the problem of unemployment among the middle classes (into which investigations were carried on by specially appointed committees, the most important being the Sapru Committee which submitted its report in 1935), in some Provinces like Bengal, Madras, Bombay, the Punjab, U.P. and Bihār, and in some of the Indian States. The solution of these problems is vitally necessary, though the stupendous and perplexing character of the task cannot be denied.

Due to the planned efforts, there has been considerable expasnion in the works of the co-operative societies in different spheres including agricultural credit, supply of farm inputs, marketing, processing, and consumer trade.

10. Famine Relief

As noted above (p. 862) important recommendations about the principles of famine relief in India were made by the Famine Commission of 1880, which had as its Chairman Sir Richard Strachey. Reference has also been made to the subsequent famines, in 1896–1897 and again in 1899–1900, and the Commissions appointed on both these occasions. The last Commission, with Sir Antony MacDonnell as its President, which reported in 1901, stressed the need for "moral strategy" or "putting heart into the people", that is, helping the people with loans and other means, as soon as there is any sign of danger, by timely and liberal grants of *takkavi* loans, by the suspension of land revenue, by being watchful about the signs of approaching calamity, by organising private charity and by enlisting non-official support. The present famine relief policy is shaped in the light of its recommendation. Side by side with the growth of the machinery for famine relief has developed the policy of famine prevention through railway and irrigation works and improvement of agriculture and industries. Under the financial decentralisation rules of the Government of India Act, 1919, each Provincial Government (except Burma, which is now separated from India, and Assam) was required to contribute every year, out of its resources, à definite sum for expenditure on famine. These annual assignments from the revenues of the Provinces were to be spent on relief of famine only, the term "Famine" covering famines caused by drought or other natural calamities; but the sum not required for this purpose was devoted to building up a Famine Relief Fund. Under the 1935 Constitution, famine relief expenditure became entirely a Provincial charge, though the annual contributions of the Provinces to the Famine Relief Fund continued as before.

11. Trade, Industry, Fiscal Changes, and Labour

A. Trade

We have already observed how after 1869, when the Suez Canal was thrown open for navigation, India's foreign trade began to expand rapidly with the growth of peace and order, improvements in means of communication, the adoption of the policy of free trade, and disappearance of internal customs barriers and transit duties in India. Great Britain for a long time held the predominant position in the Indian market. But after the end of the nineteenth century, other countries, like Germany, the United States of America and Japan, appeared as her competitors in Indian trade, and the volume of it, as a whole, consequently increased. The War of 1914–1918 first caused a temporary reduction in the volume of this trade, particularly the import trade. But owing to some favourable factors on the termination of the war, there was a trade boom in India as in other countries, which again was followed by a trade depression. After a temporary recovery, trade received a severe setback due to general economic depression throughout the world. In 1932–1933 the export trade declined in value to Rs. 136 crores, and the import trade reached the lowest level, that is, Rs. 117 crores, in 1933–1934. Soon there was a partial recovery. During 1934–1935 the value of the export trade rose to Rs. 155 crores and of the import trade to Rs. 135 crores. The report of the Economic Adviser to the Government of India for 1939 stated that India " witnessed the culmination of a period of recovery in world trade, world production and international price level in 1937–1938 ". But " the turnover of India's overseas trade in merchandise for the year 1938–1939 suffered a substantial reduction as compared with 1937–1938 ".

Important changes have taken place in recent times in the distribution of India's trade. Before the War of 1914–1918, there was a disitnct tendency on the part of India's foreign trade to divert itself from the United Kingdom to the other European countries. During the war the United Kingdom recovered to a large extent her share in the export trade, though it afterwards decreased so far as the import trade was concerned, owing to he active competition of the United States of America, Japan and the Central European countries. The United Kingdom's share in the import trade was 40.6 per cent in 1934–1935 as compared with 64 per cent in 1913–1914. Subsequently there was some recovery in her share, and the Ottawa preferences to imports from the United Kingdom were meant to benefit her. Besides India's external trade, her internal trade includes the coasting trade and inland trade. The coasting trade with Burma is of special importance.

The matter of commercial intelligence began to attract increasing attention. Besides the Department of Commercial Intelligence and Statistics

(functioning since 1922), there were Indian Trade Commissioners in London and Hamburg. Nonofficial bodies like the European and Indian Chambers of Commerce also took much interest in the development of trade.

B. Industry

The Famine Commission of 1880 and 1901 emphasised the need of industrialising India as one of the means of combating the problem of famine. A change from the indifferent attitude of the Government towards industries seems to have commenced in the time of Lord Curzon, at whose instance a separate Imperial Department of Commerce and Industries was created in 1905. The *Swadeshī* Movement also gave rise to considerable enthusiasm for the industrial regeneration of India. But the Government again reverted to the old *laissez-faire* policy, when in 1910 Lord Morley, the then Secretary of State for India, who was suspicious even of creating a Provincial Department of Industries, sent a despatch to the Government of India discouraging attempts at the development of industries.

The war of 1914–1918 strikingly revealed India's industrial poverty and made the Government realise clearly the importance of industrialisation not only from the economic but also from the military point of view. After the Government of India had issued Rules for the Defence of the country which authorised the Executive to control supplies of all kinds and to organise the resources of India, a Munitions Board was established in February, 1917. Although the primary functions of this Board were to control the purchase and manufacture of Government stores and munitions of war, it indirectly gave a great stimulus to industrial development in India by supplying information and advice, by placing orders with Indian firms and in some other ways.

In response to Indian public demand, the Government appointed an Industrial Commission in 1916 to examine the possibilities of industrial development, to find out new openings for Indian capital in trade and industries and to recommend means of Government encouragement to industries. The Industrial Commission presented its report in 1918 and recommended to the Government the initiation of " a policy of energetic intervention in industrial affairs ", the establishment of Imperial and Provincial Departments of Industry, the organisation of scientific and technical services, the provision of greater facilities for industrial and technical education, a change in the policy of purchasing stores, the grant of technical and financial aid to industries, the encouragement of industrial co-operation, and the improvement of transport and freight facilities. Government accepted these recommendations and tried, to some extent, to carry them out in practice. After the reforms, " industries " became a Transferred

subject. The fate of Indian industries is closely linked with the tariff policy of the Government, which we will now try to review briefly.

C. Fiscal Changes

The stimulus to industries during 1914–1918 was temporary. Soon after its termination, foreign competition appeared again and the need of protection for Indian industries was felt. As a matter of fact, Indian public opinion had demanded a revision of tariff policy for about half a century before the war, and this demand revived under post-war conditions. Although this subject was excluded from the deliberations of the Industrial Commission, the Montagu-Chelmsford Report supported India's claim to determine her own tariff policy. The Joint Select Committee on the India Bill recommended the grant of fiscal autonomy to India. In response to a resolution for full fiscal autonomy, moved in the Council of State in 1921, the Secretary of State sent a despatch, dated 30th June, 1921, accepting this principle. A Fiscal Commission was appointed in the same year to determine the nature of this policy. This Commission recommended the adoption of a policy of "*discriminate protection*", the claims of the respective industries to protection being determined by a Tariff Board. The Government accepted this recommendation and a Tariff Board was appointed in July, 1923. Acting under the instructions of the Government, the Board examined the claims of many industries, and protection was extended to the iron and steel, cotton, paper, sugar, salt, match and other industries. Certain important changes in the tariff were afterwards introduced by several Acts, the most important of these being the Indian Tariff (Ottawa Trade Agreement) Amendment Act, 1932, which gave effect to the tariff changes necessitated by the Trade Agreement made between the Government of India and His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom at the Imperial Economic Conference held at Ottawa during July–August, 1932. These agreements, which came into force from 1st January, 1933, provided for certain margins of preference on a number of goods on importation into India from the United Kingdom or from a British Colony. According to some Indian politicians and commercialists, they benefited British trade with India at the cost of India's "wider interests", as Pandit Jawaharlāl Nehru puts it in his *Autobiography*.

D. Labour

The modern conditions of life have made the regulation of labour an almost indispensable duty of the State in India. The agitation carried on by Lancashire and Dundee trade interests led to the appointment of a

Factory Commission in 1908, which after carefully investigating conditions in factories of different kinds recommended certain important changes. These were accepted in the main by the Government and were finally embodied in the Factory Act of 1911. The Act limited the working hours of children and women to seven and eleven respectively and provided for a compulsory recess for half an hour in the midday in all factories. The old limits (nine to fourteen) for the age of the children were retained, but arrangements were provided to get their age properly certified. Particularly in the case of textile industries, the working hours of children were limited to six and of adult males to twelve. Certain new provisions were introduced about the health and safety of the industrial workers. The ferment in the labour world after 1919 made further changes in the conditions of labour in India necessary, and the incentive for these came this time also mainly from outside. The Draft Conventions and the Draft Recommendations of the International Labour Conference at Washington (1921) were introduced into the reformed Indian Legislature and became law in 1922. This new Act widened the definition of factory; abolished the old distinction between textile and non-textile factories; raised the minimum age for a child employee from nine to twelve, and the maximum age from fourteen to fifteen, provided that the children should not be employed for more than six hours a day, and fixed compulsory rest intervals; restricted the work of all adults to eleven hours a day and sixty hours a week, with a rest interval of one hour after six hours' work and a regular weekly holiday, and made regulations regarding payment for overtime work. But the provisions of this Act applied only to factories and not to all industrial workers. It underwent slight amendments in 1923 and 1926 to ensure better working. A Workmen's Compensation Act was passed in 1923 providing compensation for certain kinds of injury, or death, of industrial workers of various classes.

But the working of these Acts for a few years revealed some defects in them, and, at the same time, industrial unrest, the influence of the labour movement, and the co-operation of India, as an original member of the League of Nations, in the International Labour Organisation at Geneva, stimulated proposals for further reform. In the middle of the year 1929 the Government of India announced the appointment, by His Majesty the King-Emperor, of a Royal Commission on Indian Labour, with the Rt. Hon. J. H. Whitley as its Chiarman, " to enquire into and report on the existing conditions of labour in industrial undertakings and plantations in British India; on the health, efficiency and standard of living of the workers; and on the relations between the employers and the employed; and to make recommendations ". The Royal Commission exhaustively reviewed the existing labour legislation and labour conditions in India, and made a series of recommendations in its Report which was published in July, 1931. It is not possible to attempt here even a brief summary of these recommendations, on some of which action was taken by the Central

and provincial Government. The most important measures of such labour legislation were the Amendment of the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1933, which further expanded the scope of the Act of 1923; the Indian Factories Act of 1934, which extended the provisions of the previous Factories Acts regarding the hours of work and sanitary and other conditions of industrial labourers; the Payment of Wages Act of 1936, which sought to regulate the payment of wages to the workers; and the C. P. Unregulated Factories Act of 1937, which regulated the labour of women and children and made provision for the welfare of labour in the factories to which the Factories Act of 1934 did not apply. The hours of work were limited to ten a day or fifty a week in all " perennial " factories. Each Province appointed Factory Inspectors to secure the observance of the Factories Acts. Efforts were made to improve the conditions of labourers through welfare work, organised occasionally by institutions like the Y.M.C.A., the Social Service Leagues, and the Depressed Classes Mission Society. Under the reformed Constitution, Congress Ministries attempted to improve the conditions of labour in various ways, and appointed Committees, such as the Bombay Textile Labour Inquiry Committee (appointed in October, 1937), the Cawnpore Labour Inquiry Committee (appointed in November, 1937), the Central Provinces Textile Labour Inquiry Committee (appointed in February, 1938), and the Bihār Labour Inquiry Committee (appointed in March, 1938), to inquire into the conditions of labour prevailing in the industrial centres and to make recommendations for their improvement. The question of representation of labour in the Central and Provincial Legislatures assumed a special importance and was considered by some committees. The Indian Delimitation Committee, which was set up in 1935 with Sir Lawrie Hammond as Chairman and published its report in February, 1936, proposed the formation of certain constituencies for the return of representatives of labour to the Federal Assembly and to the Provincial Legislative Assemblies on the basis of registered trade unions.

Besides State legislation and philanthropic activities for the benefit of labour, we should note the influence of the labour movement itself in Modern India. This movement owed its origin to the general awakening following the First World War, combined with the high prices of the bare necessities of life and the fixed wages which were mainly responsible for the deplorable conditions of living. The Madras Labour Union, formed by Mr. B. P. Wadia in 1918, may be regarded as the first trade union in the proper sense of the term. The labourers soon realised the value of organisation and the efficacy of strikes. In 1920 Mr. Nārāyan Malhar Joshi created the first All-India Trade Union Congress. Trade Unions sprang up in most of the industrial centres and strikes broke out frequently. Trade Union activities were to a certain extent legalised by the Indian Trade Unions Act of 1926. The Royal Commission recommended a reconsideration of this Act, especially regarding the limitations imposed on the activities of Trade Unions and

their officials. The Trade Union Movement continued to expand, though its progress was much hampered by illiteracy among workers, lack of efficient leadership, the agricultural outlook of Indian labour and its heterogeneous character. In 1929 there was a split among its leaders due to the attempts of the Communists to capture the Trade Union Congress. Moderate Trade Unionists under the leadership of Mr. N. M. Joshi seceded from the Congress and started a new organisation called the Indian Trades Union Federation. A further split occurred in 1931. Attempts were made to bring about unity in the ranks of Indian labour by amalgamating all the bodies into one central organisation, but without success. In 1938 the combined Trade Union Congress had a total membership of about 354,500 with 191 affiliated Unions.

12. Social and Religious Reforms

The cultural renaissance which marked the advent of a new age in India was in full vigour during the first half of the twentieth century.

We have reviewed the activities of the Brāhma Samāj, the Prārthanā Samāj, the Ārya Samāj, the Deccan Education Society, the Theosophical Society and the Rāmakrishna Mission during the second half of the nineteenth century. The twentieth century saw a continuation of these efforts for popular uplift.

After completing his twenty years' service with the Deccan Education Society, Gokhale founded in 1905 the still more famous organisation known as the Servants of India Society. The object of the Society was to train " national missionaries for the service of India, and to promote, by all constitutional means, the true interests of the Indian people". Its members should be such as were " prepared to devote their lives to the cause of the country in a religious spirit ". It was not a Society founded for any specific activity, political, educational, economic, or social, but merely a group of men who were trained and equipped for some form of service to the motherland.

" Whether such members in future were to run schools or papers or legislatures or co-operative societies or slum work or what not—that was not of prime importance, but what was to be the distinctive feature, the indispensable characteristic of any such work, was to be the fact that it was to be undertaken for its own sake, as a good work which is its own end, not for the furtherance of a party or a class or a corporation or—least of all —for personal self-aggrandisement."

Both Gokhale and Srinivāsa Sāstrī, who succeeded him as President of the Society on his death in 1915, devoted themselves mainly to politics and attained unique distinction in that line. Some other members devoted themselves to work of other kinds and developed independent organisations. We will refer to the activities of three of them.

(i) One such member, Nārāyan Malhar Joshi, founded in 1911 the Social Service League in Bombay, its aim being "to secure for the masses of the people better and reasonable conditions of life and work". "Within fifteen years they had come to run 17 night-schools for 760 adults, 3 free day schools for half-timers in the mills, 11 libraries and reading rooms with a daily average of 200 readers, and 2 day nurseries. They had organised over a hundred co-operative societies; they did Police Court Agents' work; gave legal advice and wrote petitions for the illiterate; they arranged fresh-air excursions for slum children and provided six gymnasia and three theatrical stages for the recreation of the working classes; they did sanitary work, gave medical relief in three dispensaries to nearly 20,000 outdoor patients per annum and had started Boys' Clubs and Scout corps."

In 1920 Mr. Joshi founded the All-India Trade Union Congress and became recognised as the foremost representative of the Labour Movement in India. He served the Labour Movement ably until 1929 when a resolution was passed at the annual meeting of the Trade Union Congress to affiliate the All-Indian Federation (founded by Mr. Joshi) to Moscow, and this leaning towards Communism forced Joshi and his adherents to leave the meeting.

(ii) Hriday Nāth Kunzru, another member of the Servants of India Society, founded in 1914 the Sevā Samiti at Allahābād. In addition to the promotion of education, sanitation, physical culture, etc., it organises social service during fairs, famines, floods, epidemics, and especially on the occasion of religious festivals like the Kumbha Melā.

(iii) Shrī Rām Bājpai organised the Sevā Samithi Boy Scouts' Association. It was founded in 1914 on the line of the world-wide Baden-Powell organisation, which at that time refused to allow Indians to join it. Although Lord Baden-Powell, as a result of his personal visit to India, raised the colour bar, Bājpai's organisation decided to preserve its separate existence, as its aim was the complete Indianisation of the Boy Scout Movement in India.

The activities of the five illustrious members of the Servants of India Society (Gokhale, Sāstrī, Joshi, Kunzru and Bājpai) will suffice to indicate clearly its role in moulding the national life of India.

The Servants of India Society conducted three papers—*The Servant of India*, an English weekly edited by Mr. S. G. Vaze; the *Dnyān Prakāsh*, the oldest Marathi daily, edited by Mr. Limaye; and the *Hitawad*, a weekly.

The minority communities in India, like the Parsis and the Sikhs, were also profoundly influenced by the wave of reformation. The Parsi community owes a great deal to its famous reformer, Behramji M. Malabari, for his brilliant services in the cause of Indian women, children, education, and journalism. The Zoroastrian Conference, inaugurated in 1910 at the instance of a Parsi priest named Dhala who had visited America and studied in Columbia University under the renowned Zoroastrian scholar, Professor Jackson, has rendered beneficial services to the community. The

Chief Khālsā Diwān, with its headquarters at Amritsar and branches in different parts of the country, advocating liberal reforms in society and culture, and the Khālsā College at Amritsar, gave eloquent proofs of Sikh awakening.

Largely through the 'Ālīgarh Movement, the history of which has been already traced, Islam in India was roused to a new life. The chief exponents of this " New Islam " were Maulavī Chirāgh 'Ālī, the Rt. Hon. Syed Amīr 'Ālī, Sir Shaikh Muhammad Iqbāl, Prof. S. Khudābakhsh and Prof. A. M. Maulavī. A number of *anjumans* or societies, and a powerful Muslim press, sprang up for the service of the Muslim community. The Ahmadiyā Movement, started by Mirzā Ghulām Ahmad of Qadian in the Gurudāspur district of the Punjab for the restoration of the " true and unpolluted faith of Islam to the followers of the Prophet ", also gained a number of followers in different parts of the world.

Under the influence of the general awakening of the country, a spirit of reform permeated various classes of Indian society and profoundly modified their ideas, habits and customs. The most striking change in Indian social life of to-day is in the position of women. Women are not only coming out of their *purdah* and receiving education, but are also taking active interest in social and political matters and are claiming their rights as citizens. As a matter of fact, the women's movement in India, which started largely under the inspiration of Ramābāī Ranade, has " succeeded with a swiftness and to a degree that would have seemed fantastic even a few years earlier ".

Attempts have been made by the State and reformers to do away by legislation with the evil of early marriage. In 1901 the Gāikwār of Barodā passed the Infant Marriage Prevention Act, which fixed the minimum marriageable age in the State, for girls at twelve and for boys at sixteen. The Age of Consent Committee met at Simla in June, 1928, to enquire into the question of marriage reforms. After its report appeared, Rāi Sāheb Harbilās Sārdā's Child Marriage Bill was passed in 1930. The Act evoked much opposition among the conservative sections of the people and did not prove very effectual in actual working. The Widow-Remarriage Movement, which had many notable Indian social reformers as its advocates, has also made some progress, though widow-remarriage is still so uncommon as to attract attention in the papers whenever it takes place. Laudable attempts to improve the lot of the widows have been made by the Mahārānī's School at Mysore, the Ārya Samāj and the Purity Society in the Punjab, and the Hindu Widow Reform League of Lucknow.

The women themselves have been zealous in making attempts to improve their lot in all possible ways. In 1923 a Women's Indian Association, with many branches, was started and opened a Children's Home in Madras. In 1924 a Birth Control League was founded in Bombay, and the journal *Navayuga* (The New Age) offered its services to the cause of this movement. Of the 6,000 members of the Indian National Conference, held at Belgaum

in December, 1924, 1,000 were women. In December, 1925, the talented Indian poetess, Sarojinī Naidu (*née* Chatterjee), became the President of the annual meeting of the Indian National Congress. The Women's Indian Association, started in Madras, has rendered valuable services to the cause of the uplift of women in a variety of ways. It opened, on 21st March, 1934, a Rescue Home to facilitate the working of the Rescue section of the Immoral Traffic Act, enforced by the Government. Muslim ladies also were affected by the spirit of reform, as is clear from the sessions of the All-India Muslim Ladies Conference since 1914. In 1919 the All-India Muslim Ladies Conference, at its Lahore session, pronounced against polygamy. Her Highness the Dowager Begam of Bhopāl presided over the annual session of the All-India Women's Conference in 1928 and she introduced many social and educational reforms for women in her State. Since 1926, the All-India Women's Conference has expressed, in its annual sessions, the legitimate demands of the women for better facilities regarding eduction, and abolition of social abuses.

The growth of political consciousness among women is strikingly illustrated by the success of the Women's Suffrage Movement since the day when the historic All-India Women's Deputation waited upon Mr. Montagu in Madras on 18th December, 1917. Mrs. Annie Besant, Mrs. Sarojinī Naidu and Mrs. Herābāī Tātā gave evidence before the Joint Select Committee on the Government of India Bill, 1919, in support of the extension of the franchise to Indian women. Representatives of Indian womanhood took part in the Round Table Conferences in London. The Government of India Act, 1935, gave political rights to Indian women far in advance of those enjoyed by them before. They were allotted 6 seats out of a total of 156 reserved for British India in the Federal Council of State and 9 out of a total of 250 so reserved in the Federal Assembly. So far as Provincial Assemblies were concerned, women had reserved to them 8 seats in Madras, 6 in Bombay, 5 in Bengal, 6 in the United Provinces, 4 in the Punjab, 4 in Bihār, 3 in the Central Provinces and Berar, 1 in Assam, 2 in Orissa and 2 in Sind. The franchise qualifications affecting them were liberalised, so that more than 6 million women (against 315,000 under the Act of 1919) received the right to vote, compared with 29 million men.

With the spread of education among women, efforts have been made to train Indian sisters ministrant to serve the poor, the sick and the distressed. The Poona Sevā Sadan, started in 1909 by the late Mrs. Ramābāī Ranade, the late Mr. G. K. Devadhar, and a few other ladies and gentlemen, and its branches in different parts of the country, have done much valuable work "with special reference to the training of nurses and midwives, the promotion of maternity and child welfare, and the finding of employment for widows". Similar work has been done by another organisation also known as the Sevā Sadan Society, started in July, 1908, by the late Mr. B. M. Malabari and Mr. Dayārām Gidumal. Important institutions to serve the same end were

inaugurated by the wives of several Viceroys. The National Association for Supplying Medical Aid by Women to the Women of India, started by the Countess of Dufferin in 1885 and having subsequently twelve provincial branches and numerous local committees, had for its object "the training of women as doctors, hospital assistants, nurses and midwives, as well as the provision of dispensaries, wards and hospitals". As a part of this Association, a special Women's Medical Service for India was constituted in 1914. The Victoria Memorial Scholarships Fund was organised by Lady Curzon in 1903 with a view to training midwives. The Lady Hardinge Medical College at Delhi, opened by Lord Hardinge on 17th February, 1916, trains Indian women in medical science. The Maternity and Child Welfare Bureau, Working in connection with the Indian Red Cross Society, has rendered useful services in training women for ministering work. The hospital known as the Chittaranjan Sevā Sadan in Calcutta has done much valuable work in this respect.

A very important feature in the social history of modern India is the gradual change in the condition of the so-called Depressed Classes, who, like the women of India, are "waking from age-long slumber to a new consciousness". Valuable philanthropic work has been done in this respect by the various Christian Societies, the Rāmkrishna Mission and particularly the Āryā Samāj, through the means of *Suḍdhi*, that is re-Hinduising people who had been converted to other religions, or Hinduising non-Hindus. The Depressed Classes Mission Society, started in Bombay in 1906 with the object of improving "the social as well as the spiritual conditions of the Depressed Classes", has been sincerely devoted to its mission. The Bhīl Sevā Mandal, founded in 1922 by Mr. Amritlāl Vithaldās Thakkar to elevate the condition of the Bhīls and other aboriginals of India, has done a great deal of useful work. The influence of the "*Harijan*" movement, started by Mahātmā Gāndhi is potent in this sphere of social service. As a matter of fact, Indian youths of to-day are keenly alive to social service, as is manifest in their activities as members of the Boy Scout Associations, the Junior Red Cross and St. John's Ambulance Associations, the Sevā Samiti Boy Scouts Association, and the Bratachārī Association, started under the guidance of Mr. Gurusaday Datta, I.C.S.

13. Progress of Education and Cultural Renaissance

The general awakening of Modern India would not have been possible without significant changes in the educational ideas and institutions of the country. Much in the sphere of education was tried and achieved in India during the nineteenth century, and still more has been accomplished in the present century. Lord Curzon's viceroyalty marks in this respect, as in several other matters, a turning-point. In January, 1902, he appointed a

Universities Commission to investigate the conditions and prospects of the Indian Universities and to recommend measures to improve their constitution and working and standard of teaching. The Commission was presided over by Mr. (afterwards Sir) Thomas Raleigh, Law Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, and included among its members two distingusihed Indians, Mr. Syed Husain Bilgrāmī, then Director of Public Instruction in the Nizam's Dominions, and Mr. (afterwards Sir) Gurudās Banerjee, a judge of the Calcutta High Court. Its report came out in June, 1904, and its recommendations were embodied in the Universities Act of 1904. This Act was intended to tighten Government control over the educational institutions of the country by limiting the number of senators and syndics and creating a majority of nominated members in the Senate. It assigned territorial limits to each University, laid down stringent conditions for the affiliation of new colleges, and prescribed a systematic inspection of colleges by the University. Such a "comprehensive scheme of officialisation" evoked protests from different quarters. But at the same time, the Act recognised the higher functions of the Universities including instruction of students, appointment of Professors and Lecturers, and equipment of laboratories and museums. Thus, though the late Sir Asutosh Mookerjee, then Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University, opposed its illiberal provisions, it was utilised by him to open the teaching section of the University of Calcutta, which has done much useful work for the cause of higher education, not only in Bengal, but also in other parts of the country.

In 1910 a Department of Education was established in the Government of India. It came to have an office of its own and a Member to represent it in the Executive Council. Sir Harcourt Butler was the first Member. The Resolution, dated 21st February, 1913. of the Government of India advocates certain measure for the advance of education and recommended the establishment of teaching and residential Universities. But the educational improvements foreshadowed in it were in most cases delayed by the War of 1914–1918 and other causes. The growth of communal consciousness and provincial patriotism greatly helped the establishment of new Universities during the period under review in various places, such as Patna, Lucknow, 'Āligarh, Benares, Āgra, Dehi, Nāgpur, Waltair, Dacca, Mysore, Hyderābād, Chidambaram, Trivandrum and Rangoon. The Indian Women's University at Poona was started in 1916 by Dhondo Keshav Karve, with Sir R. G. Bhandārkar as its first Chancellor. The Vishwabhārati (1921) founded by Rabindranāth Tagore at Śāntiniketan, Bolpur, is a unique educational institution, famous for its cosmopolitan outlook. It represents a happy blending of the East and the West, and of Old and New India.

The progress of education continued to be reviewed by different Commissions and Committees, some of whose recommendations were put into practice by the Government. These bodies were the Calcutta University Commission with Dr. (afterwards Sir) Michael Sadler as its Chairman and Sir Asutosh

Mookerjee as a leading member, whose report was published in August, 1919; the Auxiliary Committee of the Indian Statutory Commission under the Chairmanship of Sir Philip Hartog, which published its Report in 1929; the Lindsay Commission, appointed in 1929 by the International Missionary Council, with Dr. A. D. Lindsay, Master of Balliol College, Oxford, as Chairman, which visited India in 1930–1931 and whose report was published in 1931; and the Unemployment Committee, United Provinces, popularly known as the Sapru Committee after the name of its President, the Rt. Hon. Sir Tej Bahādur Sapru, which was appointed by the Government of the United Provinces in 1934 and whose report was published in 1936.

There were three important bodies to look after the progress of education in general and to consider changes, if necessary. The Central Advisory Board of Education, created first in 1920 under the Chairmanship of the Educational Commissioner of the Government of India, but abolished in 1923 as a measure of economy on the recommendation of the Indian Retrenchment Committee presided over by Lord Inchcape, was revived in 1935. Since then it has made many suggestions regarding the reform of the present system of education in all stages, higher, secondary or primary, and of all types, literary or vocational. According to the recommendation of the Universities Conference at Simla, summoned by the Government of India in May, 1924, an Inter-University Board for India came into existence during 1925, and has since then been discharging useful functions by collecting information and stimulating thought about present-day University problems. The Bureau of Education in India, abolished in 1923 as a measure of retrenchment, was revived by the Government of India in 1937 "for dealing specially with the collection and dissemination of literature relating to educational problems in the various Provinces".

The Reforms of 1919, supplemented by those of 1935, placed education in the Provinces under the control of their Ministers of Education. The numerical strength of the students in the secondary and primary schools undoubtedly increased. During the year 1935–1936, 51 per cent of the boys and 17 per cent of the girls of school-going age were on the school rolls. But at the same time it is true that there has been much "stagnation" and "wastage" in secondary and primary education. The state of literacy in India, as compared with that of other countries, has been unsatisfactory. The introduction of compulsory and free primary education is one of the important problems of India to-day. As early as 1911 the Honourable Mr. G. K. Gokhale introduced a Bill for this purpose in the Imperial Legislative Council. In later years the question assumed greater and greater importance Indian leaders of all shades of opinion constantly urged upon the Government the supreme need of the measure. Some attempts were made to drive away illiteracy. Thus eight Provincial Legislatures passed Primary Education Acts "authorising the introduction of compulsory education by local option"; and the Education Minister of one Province inaugurated an Adult

Education campaign to make adults able to read and write. Plans to give secondary education a vocational bias were also considered.

The question of the medium of instruction in educational institutions attracted serious attention under the pressure of national awakening. A representative Conference, which met at Simla in 1917 under the Chairmanship of Sir Sankaran Nair, the then Education Member, discussed the position of English as a foreign language and as a medium of instruction in public schools. Its decisions were not conclusive. But the use of the modern Provincial languages as the medium of instruction and examination in schools and in some places in colleges gradually increased. Some educationists also thought of evolving a common script for the whole of India. Good pioneer work in this direction was done by Mr. A. Latiff, I.C.S., by the introduction of the Romanised Urdu Script.

It is interesting to note that education of women, attempts for the spread of which began in the nineteenth century, has progressed greatly during the present century through State efforts and the activities of various reformed *Samājas* and Societies, like the Brāhma Samāj, the Ārya Samāj and the Servants of India Society. Colleges specially meant for girls were established, and in some Provinces co-education made good progress; for example, in Madras and Assam more girls studied in boys' institutions than in those for girls. Co-education is, however, itself a delicate problem, which requires tactful handling. The Indian Women's University, started at Poona in 1916 by Professor Karve and transferred to Bombay in 1936, has done much valuable work. Customs and prejudices which had so long been detrimental to the growth of education of women are fast disappearing, and a strong public opinion has grown up in its favour, though there are differences of opinion amongst educationists and other thinkers about the nature of education suitable for our womenfolk. Very valuable work of Educational Reform is being done by the All-India Women's Conference, which holds its meetings annually and has constituent conferences in different parts of the country. An All-India Women's Educational Fund Association has been started in connection with this Conference. In 1930 a special Committee was appointed by this Association to determine the feasibility of establishing a central Teachers' Training College. The recommendation of the Committee for the establishment of a college, "on absolutely new lines which would synthesise the work of existing provincial colleges by psychological research", was accepted by the Association, and accordingly the Lady Irwin College was established in New Delhi. This College provides a three years' Teachers' course for those who intend to qualify themselves as High School teachers of Home Science; others may take the Home course of two years.

Several factors, such as growing contact with the outside world, eager yearning for the revival of the cultural treasures of the past, the desire to reform all aspects of life, and speculations about the problems of common weal

and common woe, have profoundly stimulated Indian thought and have caused a comprehensive cultural renaissance, the influence of which is visible on modern Indian Literature as well as Art. Indeed, we have a new age for the Indian regional literatures, Bengali, Oriyā, Hindi, Urdu, Marāthī, each of which presents a harmonious blending of Eastern ideas with those of the West. High-class works have been produced during the last hundred years in different branches of literature, fiction, drama, poetry and essay. In modern Bengali literature, the influence and contributions of Iswara Gupta, Madhusudan Dutt, Bankim Chandra Chatterjee and Rabindranāth Tagore have been unique. Shreejut Sarat Chandra Chatterjee's contributions in the sphere of Bengali literature are also of profound significance. His novels present an interesting picture of the Bengali society of modern times—its merits and demerits, its sorrows and joys—and thus supply sufficient food for reflection to those who seek to reform our social life. The drama has been enriched by the writings of Madhusudan Dutt, Dinabandhu Mitra, Girish Chandra Ghosh, D. L. Roy, Amritalal Basu, and others. This period has further witnessed the production of outstanding biographies and autobiographies; and some notable attempts have been made to reconstruct the history of Bengali literature, largely through the encouragement of the late Sir Asutosh Mookerjee. The *Vangiya Sāhitya Parishad* has been doing much to revive the lost treasures of Bengali literature. Some Indians have to their credit important compositions in English; the names of Toru Dutta and of Mrs. Sarojinī Naidu, deserve special mention in this respect.

Urdu, Hindi and Oriyā literatures are showing signs of advance. The writings of Sir Muhammad Iqbāl of the Punjab have given birth to a new age in the history of Urdu literature. A great movement is now on foot for the development of Hindi literature.

One very striking feature of Indian cultural renaissance is the spirit of research which animates the study of the past history and antiquities of this country. Since the foundation of the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1784, a large number of European as well as Indian scholars have devoted themselves earnestly to this branch of study, and their labours have produced marvellous results. The ancient Monuments Preservation Act, passed during the Viceroyalty of Lord Curzon, for the protection of historic monuments and relics, and also for State control over the excavation of ancient sites and traffic in antiquities, gave an immense impetus to the cause of research. Under the guidance of the Archaeological Department of the Government of India, and a few other institutions, valuable scientific excavations, which have considerably modified many of the old views about the ancient history of India, have been made on historic sites. Those at Mohenjo-dāro in Sind, Harappā and Taxilā in the Punjab, Pāṭaliputra and Nālandā in Bihār, Pāhārpur, Mahāsthān and Bāngad in Bengal, Sāñchi in the Bhopāl State, Sārnāth near Benares and Nāgārjunikondā in the Madras Presidency deserve special mention. Much attention has also been paid to the establishment and

development of museums, in different places, as centres of research and education. Further, the epigraphical materials disclosed by official as well as non-official efforts have supplied us with valuable details about the history and chronology of various dynasties of India. Some of the Indian Universities notably the Universities of Calcutta Dacca Benares and Madras, and



VICTORIA MEMORIAL, CALCUTTA

organisations like the All-India Oriental Conference, the Indian History Congress, the Bhāndārkar Oriental Research Institute and the *Bhārat Itihāsa Samsodhaka Mandala* at Poona, the Indian Historical Records Commission and the *Vangiya Sāhitya Parishad*, are giving considerable impetus to the scientific study of Indian history and antiquities.

Indians have also made in the present century remarkable progress in the study of science, philosophy and politics. The valuable discoveries of Sir J.C. Bose, Sir P. C. Ray, Sir C. V. Raman and Dr. Meghnād Sāhā, and the painstaking as well as fruitful anthropological studies of Rāī Bahadur S. C. Roy of Chotanāgpur, have earned them a wide reputation. The cause of scientific research in India is being furthered by scientific surveys, like the Zoological Survey of India, the Botanical Survey of India and the Geological Survey of India, and by the activities of the Indian Science Congress, which meets each year in January. Attention has also been devoted to philosophic studies, through the inspiration of teachers like Sir B. N. Seal, Sir S. Rādhākrishnan, and others. The Indian Universities have become keenly interested in the study of Political Science, and much useful work has been done by the Indian Institute of Political and Social Science, started on 30th March, 1917, "to promote a systematic study of political and social science in general and Indian political and social problems in particular in all their aspects...."

The spirit of renaissance has also produced a finer appreciation and cultivation of the Fine Arts such as painting and music. Dr. Abanindranāth Tagore has taught and inspired a group of artists; other famous artists of the period are Nandalāl Bose of Bengal and 'Abdur Rahmān Chaghatai of the Punjab, and some members of the Ukil family. The Bombay School of Art has tried to develop a new style by the application of Western technique and methods to current Indian conditions. The artistic renaissance of India owes a great deal to Mr. E. B. Havell, who was for some years Principal of the Government School of Art in Calcutta and left India in 1907, and to Dr. A. K. Coomāraswāmy, who did much to preach the majesty and glory of Indian art. As with painting, there has also been a revival of sculpture. Modern Indian architecture divides itself sharply into two classes: (*i*) that of the indigenous Indian "Master-builder", to be found chiefly in the Indian States, particularly in Rājputāna, and (*ii*) that based on an imitation of Western models. During recent years, there has been a tendency to revive old architectural styles. A new spirit in the cultivation of music is evident in our country. The efforts of some members of the Tagore family are largely responsible for a finer appreciation of music; and new schools for the scientific study and practice of Indian music, vocal as well as instrumental, have sprung up in Calcutta, Bombay, Poona, Barodā and several other places. Earnest efforts are being made to revive indigenous types of dances and drama. The *Prāchīn Kāmarūpī Nritya Sangha* of Assam is trying to train boys and girls in the characteristic dances of that Province. In South India efforts are being made for the revival and development of *Kathākali*. Good work is being done in this field by Rabindranāth Tagore's Vishwabhāratī, the Travancore University and the Kerala *Kalāmandalam*.

CHAPTER VIII

INDIA DURING AND AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

1. India's War Contributions

When Britain declared war against Germany on 3rd September, 1939, India was automatically involved in what afterwards became a global war. Britian was naturally anxious to utilize India's abundant resources for the prosecution of the war. Later, the proximity of the theatres of war to India's borders increased her strategic importance.

For reasons to be noted later, the two great political parties in India, the Congress and the Muslim League, refused to co-operate with the Government in its war effort. The Indian Princes, however, stood solidly behind the Government, which had also no difficulty in securing sufficient recruits without any compulsion. It is unnecessary to describe in detail the course of the war. Suffice it to say that it took a calamitous turn for the Allies in the summer of 1940. First Norway and Denmark, and then Belgium, Holland, and France, quickly fell under enemy control. Britain's own downfall seemed imminent, but the Royal Air Force heroically beat off the superior numbers of the German aircraft, and frustrated the plans for a German invasion of England. The entry of Italy into the war on the side of Germany was regarded as a serious menace to the Suez Canal, the "life-line" of the British Empire. It was thought possible that the enemy might be able to occupy Egypt and eventually make an attack upon India. In fact, the British Parliament passed in mid-June the India and Burma (Emergency Provisions) Act authorizing the Governor-General, "in the event of a complete breakdown of communications with the United Kingdom," to exercise some of the powers of the Secretary of State.

At this fateful and critical moment in the history of Great Britain, her war efforts were greatly reinforced by the man-power and material resources of India. Indian troops fought with their traditional bravery in Africa and the Middle East till the tide turned in favour of the Allies. The part they played in liquidating the Italian Empire in Africa was, as the Viceroy observed in December, 1941, "of the first significance and of the greatest value".[1] Indian troops also gave splendid assistance to the Allied cause throughout the struggle for the liberation of Europe till the final collapse

[1] *The Indian Annual Register*, 1945, Vol. II, p. 284.

of the Axis powers in that continent in May, 1945. India's contributions towards the achievement of victory were both manifold and substantial, and earned the highest praise. Lieut.-General Mark Clark, the American General in command of the Allied arms in Italy, paid the following tribute to the valour of Indian troops: "The achievements in combat of these Indian soldiers are noteworthy. They have carried on successfully in grim and bloody fighting against a tenacious enemy helped by terrain particularly favourable for defence. No obstacle has succeeded in delaying them for long or in lowering their high morale or fighting spirit....The Fourth, Eighth and Tenth Indian Divisions will for ever be associated with the fighting for Cassino, the capture of Rome, the Arno valley, the liberation of Florence and the breaking of the Gothic Line. I salute the brave soldiers of these three great Indian divisions." General Leese,[1] the commander of the 8th Army, and General Sir Claude Auchinleck, the Commander-in-Chief in India, spoke in the same strain.

A highly important part was also played by the Indian troops in withstanding the Japanese attack and in driving them out of the territories they had occupied on India's frontier. General Sir William Slim, Commander of the 14th Army, which completely destroyed Japan's military power in South-East Asia, bore testimony to the wonderful services of the Indians in this epic struggle. " India was," he observed in 1946, "our base, and three-quarters of everything we got from there. The best thing of all we got from India was the Indian army. Indeed, the campaign in Burma was largely an Indian Army campaign. The bulk of the fighting troops and almost the whole of those on the lines of communication were soldiers of the Indian Army, and magnificent they were. India, too, trained and sent us our reinforcements."[2]

The pre-war strength of the Indian Army was 182,000. By the middle of 1945 the Army numbered over 2,000,000 men although recruitment had continued all along on a voluntary basis. The casualties in the ranks of the Indian troops numbered 180,000, of whom "one in six was killed besides 6,500 merchant seamen, who were either killed or missing." In addition, bombing caused 4,000 civilian casualties. There would have been larger casualties but for the yeomen service rendered by the members of the Civil Defence Corps, numbering at one time 82,000.[3]

There was a proportionate increase in recruitment to the officer class, including both King's Commissioned officers and Viceroy's Commissioned officers. The Indian Military Academy at Dehra Dun made provision for 600 cadets, compared with 200 before the war, and other Officer Training Schools were opened. Though there were only 400 Indian Officers at the outbreak of the war, the number of Indian Commissioned and King's Commis-

[1] *The Statesman*, Nov. 7, 1944.
[2] *Asiatic Review*, April, 1946.
[3] For this section, see (1) *Statistics relating to India's War Effort* (Government of India Publ., Feb., 1947); (2) *The Indian Annual Register*, 1945, Vol. I, pp. 277–296.

sioned officers had risen to more than 10,000 at its close. There was a large increase in the number of training schools of all descriptions to bring about the fuller mechanisation of the Army and secure more efficient training. The Indian Artillery was also greatly expanded and developed. Valuable services were rendered by the Corps of Indian Electrical and Mechanical Engineers, formed on 1st May, 1943, for the repair, recovery and maintenance of the technical equipment of the Indian Army; the Indian Signal Corps, formed in 1922 and greatly expanded during this war; the Indian Army Medical Corps, formed in 1943; and the Women's Auxiliary Corps numbering over 10,000, formed to release soldiers and technicians for more active duty. The Royal Indian Navy, with its personnel raised from 1,200 officers and men at the commencement of the war to about 30,000 by the beginning of 1944, had notable services and exploits to its credit. The Indian Air Force (started in 1932 and subsequently designated the Royal Indian Air Force), with strength augmented from 200 to 27,000, and equipped with modern aircraft, both fighters and bombers, fought gallantly over Burma from 1942 onwards. India also made very large contributions to the Allies in arms, ammunition, equipment and various other kinds of war material. Special reference must be made to the Tata Iron and Steel Company and the Steel Corporation of Bengal, which considerably assisted the war effort by speeding up the production of steel. Indian shipyards built 2,000 small vessels during the war, with a total tonnage of 100,000 tons. Large numbers of Indian railway wagons were sent to the Middle East.

The Indian States were liberal in their help. Besides supplying more than 375,000 recruits for the fighting forces of India, they provided men for technical work, and important materials, such as steel, blankets and other kinds of woollen cloths, silk for parachute manufacture, webbing cloth, and rubber products. The total financial contributions of the States exceeded Rs. 65,000,000. About half the total contribution to the Viceroy's Fund came from them.

2. India's Participation in Efforts for Peace

Having made this immense contribution towards the achievement of victory by the Allied powers, India showed a genuine interest in the solution of the problems of tormented humanity and became actively associated with the organizations working for international security and peace. She was associated with the principal organs and specialised agencies of the United Nations Organization. She is a signatory to its charter and is an original member of it. One of her representatives became the Chairman of the Social and Economic Council of the U.N.O. and rendered much valuable assistance in the difficult initial stages. Her representatives all played very important parts in the United Nations' Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation.

In the 1946 session of the U.N., Indian representatives took an independent line on some major issues. They succeeded in making the U.N. take up the question of the treatment of Indians in South Africa against the opposition of the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. India also tried persistently to protect the rights of politically backward peoples in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations. But in 1947, on two matters in which she was directly interested, that is, her election to the Security Council and the dispute with South Africa, she did not succeed in gaining what she hoped for. She continued, however, to participate actively in the work of the United Nations. As tension developed between the two great groups of world powers, one under the leadership of the U.S.A. and Great Britain, and the other under the U.S.S.R. (Russia), India wisely proclaimed her policy of not identifying herself with either group. She also came to have her diplomatic representatives, of various ranks and designations, from Ambassadors to Consuls and Commissioners, in different countries abroad. Similarly foreign countries stationed here their representatives, diplomatic or consular.

India not only participated in many International Conferences like the Pacific Relations Conference (1943–1944), the World Trade Union Conference (February, 1945), the Commonwealth Relations Conferenee (February–March, 1945), the World Trade Union Congress (September, 1945), the Subject Peoples Conference (London, October, 1945), and the International Labour Conference at Geneva (July, 1947), but also organised the Asian Relations Conference (New Delhi, 23rd March–2nd April, 1947). She also exchanged delegations and missions and entered into various treaties with other countries. Associations interested in India sprang up in foreign countries, e.g. the National Committee for India's freedom, formed on 25th October, 1943, with headquarters at Washington, the Australian India Association formed in October, 1943, and the Indo-Iranian Cultural Society, Teheran, founded in 1944.

Without identifying herself with any of the blocks in the United Nations, India has played an important role in it. The awakening of the Afro-Asian Nations is a significant feature in the history of the modern world and India has welcomed it in the right spirit. The Asian Relations Conference, which met in New Delhi in March–April, 1947, and the Conference of the Colombo Powers (Burma, Ceylon (Sri Lanka), India, Indonesia, and Pakistan), which was held in April–May, 1954, were concrete milestones in the growth of the idea of co-operation and harmony among the Afro-Asian countries. But a highly important landmark in this respect was the Conference held at Bandung in Indonesia (18th to 24th April, 1955). India was one of the sponsoring powers for the Bandung Conference and the most significant decision of this Conference was its "Declaration on World Peace and Co-operation".

During recent years, in spite of the menace of a "cold war", the formation of military alliances and supply of military aid, and some grave complication in international politics, India has steadfastly adhered to the policy of non-

alignment and to the five principles of *Panchsheel*, namely, mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful co-existence. The Tashkent Declaration of 10th January, 1966, marked the culmination in the mission of peace of India's Prime Minister, the late Lal Bahadur Shāstri.

At the Commemorative Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations held from 14th to 24th October, 1970, the Prime Minister of India called upon the United Nations " to strive to bring about an era of international transformation by consent, a new era of justice and peace". India has participated in many other international meetings of the allied bodies of the United Nations.

India has consistently adhered to her principles of international amity and co-existence through trade and other agreements. Several Indian delegations visited different countries in 1973, 1974, and 1975. On 15th March, 1974, India and Poland signed in New Delhi, a five-year agreement on co-operation in science and technology. During the months of November and December, 1974, Heads of States and ministers of various friendly countries visited India in quick succession. Through such contacts the Government of India have tried to promote bilateral relations, especially in trade and commerce. Those who visited India included Prime Ministers of Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, President Nimeri of Sudan, and Prime Minister Sunderman of the German Democratic Republic. The agreements signed by India with these countries one after the other, are calculated to develop mutual co-operation and cordial political relations will logically follow these commercial engagements. It is significant to note that half a dozen Indo-Czechoslovak agreements were signed during the stay of the Czechoslovak Prime Minister, Dr. Lubomir Strougal, in New Delhi. The agreements provided for a firm basis for co-operation in different spheres between the two countries and called for removal of foreign military basis in the Indian Ocean. The German Democratic Republic also approved India's stand on the Indian Ocean. A Trade Protocol for 1975 was signed between India and Rumania on 30th November, 1974, according to which the trade turnover between the two countries was fixed at Rs. 113 crores. On 19th July, 1975 India and Libya signed in Tripoli an oil agreement for technical co-operation and exchange of mutual aid for development projects in two countries. On 25th July, 1975 India and Mexico signed agreements of scientific and cultural co-operation.

In December 1975, President Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed visited Sudan and at the end of his visit a joint communiqué was issued in Khartoum in which both countries stressed the need, to "achieve the objective of making the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea area a zone of peace free from foreign military bases".

Relations between India and France are growing more cordial. France

and India "should act together to encourage the emergence of a world that is more just and more interdependent", said French President Valery Giscard D'Estaing on 29th July, 1976, in his speech at a ceremony when India's new ambassador to France, Mr. Ramchandra Dattatreya Sathe presented his credentials.

3. Post-War Economic Conditions

A. Development of Industries

The social and economic effects of the Second World War on India were profound and far-reaching. No branch of economic life remained unaffected, and with the cessation of hostilities new forces were released in the social and cultural sphere, so that the country had to face various acute problems of reconstruction and readjustment. The war can indeed be regarded as marking the beginning of a new social order.

Some favourable factors, such as the growing demand for war materials both at home and from other parts of the Commonwealth, restrictions on imports, and greater care and assistance on the part of the Government with regard to industries, contributed to increased activity and output in all items of industrial manufacture except jute, matches and wheat flour. The decline in jute manufacture was due principally to lack of demand, and the fall in the production of matches to lack of raw materials, while wheat flour dropped owing to the shortage of supplies for mills, though the crops were relatively large. Petroleum and electrical power were the outstanding examples of increased production. Labour shortage affected the production of coal and iron ore. Though India's shipbuilding industry had not yet satisfied legitimate national expectations, it may be noted that shipbuilding yards were opened in Vizagapatam in 1940, and within two years 4,000 sea-going ships were repaired. In April, 1947, the Reconstruction Policy Sub-Committee on Shipping recommended a planned development of Indian Shipping on economic as well as strategic considerations.

The industrial policy of independent India, envisaging a mixed economy, was first announced in 1948. A new statement of industrial policy, following the acceptance of "socialist pattern of society as the national objective" was made on 30th April, 1956. According to it many of the major industries became State-owned, with the expectation that private enterprises would supplement the efforts of the State in these fields. Even after demarcation, it remained open to the State to undertake any kind of industrial production.

There was rapid growth of industries during the first two decades of planned development. Many new industries were started. Beginnings were also made of heavy machine-building and heavy engineering industries. Public sector has expanded rapidly since independence.

During the First and Second Five-Year Plans (1951–1952 to 1960–1961) there was remarkable "growth and diversification" of industries. Development of industries was "markedly uneven" during the years of the Third Five-Year Plan (1961–1966) and the subsequent Annual Plans (1966–1969). In the Fourth Five-Year Plan the policy in the industrial field shifted from "growth with stability" to "growth with justice". The industrial programmes were so framed as to rectify "imbalances in the industrial structure and to bring about the maximum utilisation of capacity already built up" The Fifth Five-Year Plan (1974–1979) is yet to be worked out.

The steel plants, set up at Rourkela, Bhilai, and Durgapur during the Second Five-Year Plan, are under the management of the State-owned Hindusthan Steel Company at Ranchi. The fifth steel plant has been established at Bokaro with Russian collaboration.

There has been rapid growth of small-scale industries during the past decade. The number of small-scale industries "registered on a voluntary basis" with the industries directorates of the States and Union Territories increased from about 36,000 in 1961 to about 3.18 lakhs on 31st December, 1972.

B. Economic Planning

The complex problems of modern times and the influences of the Second World War created in India, as in most other countries, an almost universal impulse towards a planned reconstruction of the entire pattern of economic life.

A National Planning Committee was constituted towards the end of 1938, at the instance of the Indian National Congress, under the Chairmanship of Pandit Jawaharlāl Nehru. It consisted of fifteen members together with representatives of the Provincial Governments and such Indian States as chose to join it. But this Committee languished, owing to the change in the political situation after the outbreak of the war and the resignation of the Congress Ministries, and it did not resume its work until September, 1945. Several other plans for economic reconstruction were later formulated, such as the Bombay Plan, the People's Plan, the Gandhian Plan, besides the Provincial plans, the plans of the Departments of the Central Government, plans for major industries, and plans of Indian States. Broadly speaking, the objectives of planning were "to raise the general standard of living of the people as a whole and to ensure useful employment for all" by the development of the resources of the country to the maximum extent possible, and by the distribution of national wealth in an equitable manner. Early in June, 1941, the Government of India formed a Post-War Reconstruction Committee. On 26th October, 1946, it announced the appointment of an Advisory Planning Board, which, in its Report of January, 1947, emphatically expressed the opinion that the "proper development of large-scale

industries can only take place if political units, whether Provinces or States, agree to work in accordance with a common plan. But the state of affairs in industry continued to be disquieting for several reasons, one of which was the continuance of strained relations between labour and management.

The Government of India appointed a Planning Commission in March 1950, to draw up a blueprint of development by considering the resources and needs of the country. The First Five-Year Plan was worked from 1951–1952 to 1955–1956 with the objects of removing the disequilibrium caused by the Second World War and partition of the country and to start simultaneously a process of all-round balanced development. The aim of the Second Five-Year Plan (1956–1957 to 1960–1961) was to promote a pattern of development for establishment of a socialistic pattern of society in India. The Third Five-Year Plan (1961–1962 to 1965–1966) "aimed at securing a marked advance towards self-sustaining growth". The Fourth Five-Year Plan (April, 1969 to March, 1974) sought to accelerate the tempo of development "in conditions of stability, at reducing fluctuations in agricultural production as well as the uncertainties of foreign aid". The Fifth Five-Year Plan, formally inaugurated in April, 1974, has a comprehensive porgramme for development of economic conditions of the country. The two major aims to be realised are the removal of poverty and attainment of economic self-reliance.

C. Labour

The war had tremendous repercussions on labour in India. Abnormal economic conditions largely the result of an unprecedented rise in the cost of living, caused an insistent demand for better conditions, which had mostly to be satisfied by increases in wages, grants of dearness allowances and bonuses, and the introduction of pension scheme, provident funds, and more scientific systems of payment.

This period was marked by a growing sense of responsibility for the improvement of the lot of the ordinary worker in this country, resulting in important labour legislation. The Factories Amendment Act, passed in April, 1946, and enforced from 1st August, reduced maximum working hours per week from 54 to 48, and from 60 to 50 in perennial and seasonal factories respectively. It fixed the maximum daily hours of work at 9 and 10 respectively The Act also prescribed uniform rates of payment for overtime work both in perennial and seasonal factories, amounting to double the ordinary rate. According to the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act of 1946, owners of industrial establishments in British India, employing a hundred or more workers, were required to define clearly the conditions of service and to have these duly certified by an officer appointed for this purpose either by the Central Government or by the

Provincial Government as the case might be. The Workmen's Compensation Act of 1946, amended in 1947, made workmen earning wages up to the maximum limit of Rs. 400 a month entitled to compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment, and laid down a scale of compensation for workers earning between Rs. 300 and Rs. 400. The Indian National Government passed some important Acts regarding industrial relations, social insurance, and improvement in conditions of work. The Provincial Governments were also alive to their responsibilities in relation to labour and industries; as a specific example may be mentioned the Bombay Industrial Relations Act (1946), which aimed at the regulation and rapid settlement of labour disputes by the establishment of labour courts and also of joint committees of management and labour in industrial establishments. Several other important steps were also taken by the Central and the Provincial Governments to harmonise industrial relations. At a Conference in 1947, representatives of employers, employees and the Government came to a unanimous decision to maintain industrial peace and to avoid lock-outs strikes, and slowing down of production for the next three years. The various adjudication awards and recommendations of the Conciliation Board also aimed at securing cordial industrial relations. For instance, the recommendations of the Board of Conciliation (1947) which investigated the causes of industrial disputes in the coalfield areas of Bengal and Bihār, were hailed as a "new deal for coal-miners". They provided for the improvement of the conditions of a class of workers whose interests had been neglected in the past.

The war gave added strength to the labour movement and facilitated the further growth of Trade Unionism. In 1940 the National Trades Union Federation, into which the Indian Trades Union Federation (p. 938) had merged, was amalgamated with the All-India Trade Union Congress. But there was again a cleavage in the ranks of labour in India in 1941, when a new central organisation, called the Indian Federation of Labour, came into being. The year 1947 saw the birth of yet another organisation, under the name of the Indian National Trade Union Congress. Drawing its inspiration from Gandhian philosophy, it sought to "secure redress of grievances without stoppages of work by means of negotiation and conciliation, and failing that, by arbitration or adjudication". This organisation, representing 577 unions of 19 industrial groups, very soon became "a force in national life". Their numbers are increased subsequently.

D. The Hard Lot of Common People

The common people of India, whose condition had always been deplorable, suffered great hardships during and after the war. There was a rapid rise in the prices of all goods "thanks to ceaseless inflation following upon the

endless stream of British purchases in India against sterling securities in the Paper Currency Reserve". There was a drastic reduction in the supply of essential commodities, particularly foodgrains and cloth, to the civilian population. " Before the war the total available supply of cereals was more than 45 million tons. During the first half of the war period it was reduced to 48 million tons....Again as against the 6,000 million yards of cloth in supply before the war, only 3,700 million yards were available in 1942; and even two years later the supplies barely exceeded 5,000 million yards."

The Report of the Sub-Committee on Labour of the National Planning Committee significantly remarks: "Notwithstanding all measures of control, regulation of price, Government procurement and distribution of essential supplies, like food, kerosene, sugar, and the entire rationing system applied to town after town and Province after Province, prices continued to soar, black markets flourished, corruption knew no bounds of rank or sex." The horrible Bengal famine of 1943, producing untold miseries for the people of that province, was undoubtedly a direct result of war conditions, but was accentuated by the "carelessness and complete lack of foresight of those in authority", and the inordinate greed of persons in certain positions. As the Famine Inquiry Commission presided over by Sir John Woodhead stated in its Report published in May, 1945: "It has been for us a sad task to enquire into the course and causes of the Bengal famine. We have been haunted by a deep sense of tragedy. A million and a half of the poor of Bengal fell victim to circumstances for which they themselves were not responsible. Society, together with its organs, failed to protect its weaker members. Indeed, there was a moral and social breakdown, as well as an administrative breakdown." The wounds inflicted on Bengal by this terrible calamity were very slow to heal.

With all that has been done by the State, the Food Corporation of India and other agencies to improve the condition of the common man, it still continues to be hard. For the last three years people have been faced with very acute problem due to the abnormal rise in prices of articles of prime necessity including foodstuffs and clothing.

E. Agriculture

Indian agriculturists and ordinary consumers were the worst sufferers by the failure of economic controls, profiteering, and widely prevailing corruption, though bigger farmers with more surplus to sell derived advantage from high prices. So far as agricultural economy is concerned, numerous problems were brought to the forefront by the Second World War—the planning or production and distribution, the provision of an adequate transport system connecting the widely separated surplus and deficit areas, maintenance of minimum stocks, effective control over costs of production and prices,

and regulation of exports and imports. The Central and Provincial Governments promised to bring about an improvement in the state of agriculture and in the lot of the common people by proper agricultural planning, which would facilitate the attainment of high levels of production and prosperity.

During the recent years various programmes have been adopted for the development of agriculture. A new system of agricultural development has been introduced since 1966–1967. Arrangements have been made for the production and distribution of improved seeds, agriculturists have been gradually made familiar with scientific and technological methods, and availability of inputs has improved. Supply of credit for agricultural requirements is being stepped up through banks, particularly agricultural banks. Minor irrigation works have been launched to help the agriculturists during periods of drought. Agro-industries corporations have been set up in different States to enable persons engaged in agricultural and allied occupations to modernise their works and for supply of agricultural machinery and implements. At present twenty-three research institutes under the Indian Council of Agricultural Research are carrying on agricultural research.

To accelerate the march of socialism and rural development on an extensive scale banks have been nationalised; 19th July, 1969 was a very significant day in the history of Indian banking. By an Ordinance the President of India nationalised fourteen major Indian private commercial banks. The banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertaking) Bill was introduced on 25th July, 1969 and passed by both Houses of Parliament on 8th August, the Bill became law on 9th August, when the President gave his assent to it. In a statement on 21st July, 1969 in Parliament, the Prime Minister thus explained the significance of the momentous decision of bank nationalisation, "The banks will now be better placed to serve the farmer and to promote agricultural production and rural development generally. Public ownership will also help curb the use of bank credit for speculative and other unproductive purpose. By severing the link between the major banks and the bigger industrial groups which have so far controlled them, Government believe that the step they have taken will also bring about the right atmosphere for the development of adequate professional management in the banking field."

F. Co-operation

An important part in this general improvement was assigned to co-operation. During 1945–1946 the number of provincial and central co-operative banks was 614, with a total membership of 226,600. The working capital increased from Rs. 60 lakhs in 1944–1945 to 69.97 lakhs in 1945-1946. The

number of agricultural co-operative societies rose from 136,354 in 1944–1945 to 146,958 in 1946, and their membership increased from 5,013,00 to 5,501,000 It was expected that they would all function fruitfully under the democratic Governments at the Centre and in the Provinces.

Due to the planned efforts, there has been considerable expansion in the works of the co-operative societies in different spheres including agricultural credit, supply of farm inputs, marketing processing and consumer trade.

G. Trade

The Second World War had, of course, far-reaching effects upon India's trade. It cut her off entirely from the continent of Europe, and from Japan and various neighbouring countries which were overrun by the Japanese, and it interfered greatly with her trade with the countries within the British Commonwealth of Nations. There was an actual decline of about 38 per cent in exports and 70 per cent in imports in 1942–1943 as compared with the pre-war year 1938–1939.[1] There was, however, an improvement in India's trading position in 1943–1944 as compared with the previous year.[2] The composition of her export trade was also vastly altered during the war. There was an increase in the exports of manufactured goods and a decrease in those of raw materials. "In 1938 manufactured articles comprised only 30·5 per cent of exports, and raw materials and food 44·3 per cent and 23·5 per cent respectively. In 1944 manufactured articles were 51·5 per cent and raw materials and food 24·7 per cent and 22·5 per cent respectively." The figures mentioned do not include imports of foodgrains, etc., made on Government account, and imports of Government stores, railway stocks, etc.[3] During 1946 the value of India's total trade amounted to Rs. 566·2 crores compared with Rs. 481·9 crores in 1945, there being a larger rise in exports than in imports. The import trade of India, however, soon began to revive and revert to the pre-war position. Even the imports of manufactured articles increased from 31·9 per cent in 1944 to 55·4 per cent in 1946, but certain considerations led to the issue, in May and July 1947, of import control orders intended to reduce imports. The export trade of India was slow to regain its pre-war position, owing mainly to the continuance of shortages of agricultural products and the "rising levels of consumptions".[4] On the cessation of hostilities private trade with different countries, so long suspended, could be resumed. Among the important changes in the direction of India's trade it may be noted that a favourable balance of trade was maintained with the countries of the British Commonwealth from the beginning

[1] *Eastern Economist*, July 30, 1940, p. 365.
[2] *Reviews of the Trade of India in* 1943–44, p. 55.
[3] *Eastern Economist*, June 28, 1946, p. 1073.
[4] *Ibid.*, November 7, 1947.

of the war till 1945, but that there was an adverse balance in 1946. The value of both export and import trade with the U.S.A. rose. "The leap in the imports of American merchandise into this country from Rs. 978 lakhs in 1938–1939 to Rs. 67,40 lakhs in 1945–1946 is very significant especially in comparison with the increase in the imports from the U.K. during the same period from Rs. 88,56 lakhs to Rs. 101,83 lakhs.[1] There was an adverse balance of trade with the U.S.A. in 1945, but this was altered in India's favour in 1946.[2] The Indian Tariff Board, constituted in 1945, made some recommendations regarding the claims of various industries for protection, but these could not be implemented at once. One notable event of the year 1947 affecting the foreign trade of India was her participation in the Geneva Trade Conference at which several important economic agreements were concluded.[3]

Since Independence, India's foreign trade has undergone considerable change and it is no longer confined to a few countries. India now has trading relations with almost all the countries of the world with whom it has entered into Trade Agreements. There are to-day three thousand items in the country's export list as against about fifty at the time when India attained independence. There has also been much increase in imports to meet the economic development needs. The total value of India's foreign trade during the years 1971–1972 and 1972–1973 amounted to Rs. 3,418·63 crores and Rs. 3,286·12 crores, respectively. India's exports began to increase during the Third Five-Year Plan period. In 1972–1973 (April–February) the total value of exports amounted to Rs. 1,703·29 crores. There has been various efforts on the part of India for the expansion and diversification of her exports. The bulk of India's exports consist of agricultural produce, jute manufacture, tea and coffee, iron ore and other minerals, and cotton fabrics. India's imports include foodgrains, fertilizers, capital goods, machinery, steel, and non-ferrous metals. In spite of an impressive growth in India's exports, there has been a deficit of Rs. 425 crores in her trade balance during the first eight months of 1974–1975 as compared with the total deficit of Rs. 437·7 crores during 1973–1974.

4. Education and Social Progress

The reorganisation of the educational system is universally recognised to be indispensable to the progress of the Indian nation. The new-born democracy and sense of nationalism must be nourished and developed by the spread of the right type of education amongst all sections of the people. It should be remembered that the percentage of literacy between 1931 and 1941 rose from 8 to only about 12. In spite of the increase in the number of

[1] *Ibid.*, January 5, 1947.
[2] *Ibid.*, November 7, 1947.
[3] *Ibid.*, January 2, 1948.

institutions, and the new educational measures of recent years, illiteracy still remains an appalling problem for the country.

At the request of the Government of India, the Central Advisory Board of Education submitted at the beginning of 1944 a post-war plan of educational reconstruction covering all the branches of education. It not only prescribed universal compuslory and free education for all boys and girls from six to fourteen, but also contemplated the provision of nursery schools and classes for ten lakhs of children below the age of six. It further recommended the provision of secondary schools with a view to fostering varied types of technical and vocational education suited to the aptitudes of pupils of different classes and capabilities. It also emphasised the need for granting liberal financial assistance in the form of free tuition, scholarships and maintenance grants, so that poverty might be no obstacle to the education of students of proved ability. As a corollary to this it stressed the need for adequate and improved arrangements for higher education, both in Universities and in professional and technical institutions of University level. The Board emphasised the necessity of "enlarging and making more practical the present provision for technical, commercial and art instruction at all levels in order to provide India with the research workers, executives and skilled craftsmen which the expansion of her industrial, economic and agricultural resources will inevitably demand". It also called for greater facilities for the cultural and recreational side of education to help the students "to fulfil themseves as individuals". Feeling that "a curriculum devoid of an ethical basis would prove barren in the end", it attached high importance to the training of character at all stages of education through a properly articulated combination of physical, mental and moral instruction. The Board made it clear that its object throughout was not "to plan an ideal system of public instruction, but rather to lay down the very minimum necessary to place India on an approximate level with other civilised communities", and suggested that the various authorities in charge of education might work out detailed schemes to suit the particular needs of their respective areas.

The Central and Provincial Governments were not slow in formulating plans and schemes for the development of primary, secondary and university education, physical education, education of the handicapped, and vocational (technical, agricultural and commerical) education. The Wardha system of Basic Education, which combines training in handicrafts with literary education, was gradually introduced in different areas by the new provincial Governments. The question of replacing English as the medium of University education was also mooted and was discussed at a meeting of the Vice-Chancellors of the different Universities and the Minister in charge of education of the Central Government. The consensus of opinion in the matter was that at this transitional stage the medium should continue to be English for a certain period, to be gradually replaced by the regional or the

State language at the end of that period.

After surveying the state of education in different parts of India, the Rādhākrishnan Commission made highly significant recommendations for its progress and development on the right lines.

Rapid changes have taken place in the sphere of education during the recent years. The number of universities has gone up from 23 (including the Visva-Bharati at Santiniketan and the Shrimati Nathubai Damodar Thackersay Women's University) in the pre-Independence period to 102, including the Bundelkhand University, Jhansi (1975), Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture and Technology (1974–1975), Acharya Narendra Dev University of Agriculture and Technology, Faizabad (1974–1975). Further nine institutions have been deemed to be universities under Section 3 of the University Grants Commission Act. According to a Report of the University Grants Commission student enrolment in the field of higher education rose from 11·55 lakhs in 1961–1962 to 39·01 lakhs in 1970–1971. There were 3·5 million students in 4,153 colleges in India in 1972–1973.

University education has received much impetus through the efforts and activities of the University Grants Commission, which has constituted in 1953 and was given an autonomous statutory status by an Act of Parliament in 1956. By a Resolution, dated 14th July, 1964, the Government of India appointed an Education Commission under the Chairmanship of Dr. D.S.Kothari, then Chairman of the University Grants Commission, "to advise Government on the national pattern of education and on the general principles and policies for the development of education at all stages and in all aspects", except legal and medical education.

The Commission justly observed in its Report that "education has to be used as a powerful instrument of social, economic and political change and will, therefore, have to be related to the long-term national aspirations the programmes of national development on which the country is engaged and the difficult short-term problems it is called upon to face". It emphasised the need for "a revolution in education, the education which in turn will set in motion the much-desired social, economic and cultural revolution". While indicating the need for modernisation of education through the "adoption of a science-based technology" the Report lays due stress on the development of essential, moral and spiritual values by suggesting the steps which the Central and State Governments and private agencies, should take in this respect. "India should", the Commission observes, "strive to bring science and the value of the spirit together and in harmony, and thereby pave the way for the eventual emergence of a society which would cater to the needs of the whole man and not only to a particular fragment of his personality." After pointing out the various defects, which are responsible for the prevailing turmoil in the educational world, the Commission significantly holds that these should be removed to help the growth of a spirit of

confidence and fellowship among all who are associated with educational institutions. Besides suggesting several measures for the eradication of this evil, it lays emphasis on two, that is, improvement of standards in institutions at all stages of education including colleges and universities and the provision for "a better standard of student services". It has made various other helpful recommendations regarding the position of teachers, numerical strength of students, condition of finances, selective admissions, well-equipped libraries, the medium of instruction, sports, games, and other corporate activities.

In December 1974, the University Grants Commission reported on the ills in the educational system of India, including restiveness among the students, and has recommended various measures of reform. In certain other quarters too there have been demands for reform in the educational system. But nothing effective has been done as yet. It is indeed a highly delicate task.

In the secondary and primary stages there has been enough of quantitative expansion and we notice some changes, one of these being the introduction of the Higher Secondary Schools. But recently decisions have been taken by some State Governments for a ten years' course in schools, a two years' Intermediate course and four or three years' B.A. degree course in colleges. There has also been expansion of facilities for higher technical education and medical education.

There has been remarkable progress in scientific research which is being carried out mainly through the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research and the different national laboratories or research institutes established under its control and in universities and research institutes aided by the Council. The Atomic Energy Commission was entrusted with the task of developing atomic energy for peaceful purposes and the principal centre for research and development of atomic energy is the Atomic Energy Establishment at Trombay near Bombay. On 18th May, 1974, India carried out an underground nuclear experiment.

Suitable steps have been taken for Rural Higher Education, for Social Education, and for education of the handicapped. Efforts are being made for promotion of art and culture and development of art consciousness among the people through the agency of the Lalit Kala Akademi (set up in 1954), the Sangeet Natak Akademi (established in 1953), the Sahitya Akademi (set up in 1954), and the Indian Council for Cultural Relations (established in 1959).

It is interesting to note that since the beginning of the twentieth century there has been a phenomenal development in female education. The Rādhākrishnan Commission made some important recommendations as regards this. At the lower primary stage the number of girls enrolled per 100 boys grew from 12 in 1901 to 39 in 1950 and to 55 in 1965. At the secondary stage such figures were 4 in 1901, 15 in 1950, and 26 in 1965. In

the field of higher education enrolment of girls increased from 264 in 1901 to 40,000 in 1950 and 240,000 in 1965. There has been further progress in this respect during the last few years. There were 2·8 crore girls in schools on 30th September, 1971; 2·2 crore in classes I–V, 39·9 lakhs in classes VI–VIII and 18·9 lakhs in classes IX–XII.

During the recent years the problem of women's education in our country has been examined by several committees. These are the National Committee on the Education of Women under the Chairmanship of Mrs. Durgabai Deshmukh; the Committee on Differentiation of Curricula between Boys and Girls under the Chairmanship of Mrs. Hans Mehta; and the Committee under the Chairmanship of Mr. M. Bhaktavatsalam which considered the problem in the six States which experienced far less development in women's education. The Kothari Commission fully agreed with their recommendations. It expressed the view that "the strategy for the development of the education of girls and women will have to take two forms". The first is to emphasise the "special" programmes recommended by the National Committee of Women's Education, and the second is to give attention to the education of girls at all stages and in all sections as an integral part of the general programme for the expansion and improvement of education. Attempts are being made in different parts of India to implement these recommendations.

Significant changes have taken place in Indian social life to make it more progressive. The uplift of women is one such change. Women have increasingly come forward and discarded their veils to participate in varied national activities and accelerate national progress. Early marriage is now an infrequent phenomenon. The progress of education and changing conditions of life have raised the marriageable age of girls considerably and in some States it has risen beyond the expectations of legislators and reformers. The Hindu Marriage Validating Act of 1949 removed the inter-caste marriage barriers. The Special Marriage Act of October, 1954, revised and replaced the Special Marriage Act of 1872, permitting a special form of marriage to a person in India and to Indian nationals in foreign countries irrespective of the faith which either party to the marriage might profess. The Hindu Marriage Act of March, 1955, provided for inter-caste marriages, divorces and payments of maintenance allowance by both husband and wife, and made bigamy punishable. The Hindu Succession Act of June, 1956, has declared property of a Hindu female to be her absolute property and has laid down general rules of succession in the case of Hindu females.

The Central Advisory Board in 1944 was emphatic as to the necessity for increasing educational facilities for women, even to the extent of making the same provision for girls as for boys. Recognising the special role of women in children's education, the Board recommended that "apart from the Pre-primary schools, where all the teachers must be women at least three-fifths of the teachers in junior Basic Schools and one-half of those in senior Basic Schools, ought to be women."

Indian women felt entitled to greater opportunities for working on a basis of equality with men, and many of them were already prominent in various spheres of life. Mrs. Radhabai Subbarayan became the first woman member of the Council of State in 1938, and in 1943 Mrs. Renuka Ray was the first woman to sit in the Central Legislative Assembly. It is a matter of pride for India that women leaders like Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit and Rajkumari Amrit Kaur came to be actively associated as representatives of their country with international bodies like the United Nations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The All-India Women's Conference forwarded to the Constituent Assembly the Charter of Women's Rights, its most import features being the demand for the introduction of universal suffrage in India's new constitution and for the formation of a social service Ministry both at the Centre and in the Provinces.

Independent India honoured its womanhood by appointing Mrs. Sarojini Naidu as Governor of the United Provinces, Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit as Ambassador in Moscow and Washington, and Rajkumari Amrit Kaur as a Minister in the Central Government, and lately Mrs. Indira Gandhi as Prime Minister of India.

CHAPTER IX

THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

1. Progress of Nationalism (1905–1916)

THE progress of the nationalist movement forms the most important feature in Indian history during the first half of the present century. The first phase of this movement has been discussed in Chapter IV, Section 3. The second phase begins in 1905. During the first twenty years of its existence, the Congress passed a series of resolutions to which the Government paid but little heed, and the only notable result of its efforts was the Indian Councils Act of 1892. This failure to achieve any conspicuous success strengthened the radical section of the Congress, which assumed a more militant attitude and demanded bolder action against British Imperialism. The new spirit, which received a fillip from Japan's great victory over Russia in 1904–1905, was brought to a head by an unpopular measure of Lord Curzon, viz. the Partition of Bengal, referred to above (p.866). The destruction of the bond that united the Bengalis, under colour of providing for administrative efficiency, considerably weakened the politically advanced Bengali intelligentsia. It split them into two separate Provinces, in both of which they would be outnumbered by other elements of the population (p. 914), and kindled religious animosities, thus interfering with the growth of a true national spirit transcending creed and community. The Partition of Bengal, carried out despite the strongest opposition from Nationalists, whose leaders included both Hindus and Muslims roused a fierce spirit of resistance among them, and gave a new turn to the political movement.

Under the guidance of leaders like Surendranath Banerjea, Bepin Chandra Pāl, A.Rasul, Aswini Kumar Datta and Arabinda Ghosh, the agitation spread like wild-fire all over Bengal and even far outside it. Mr. Gokhale, who presided over the Congress in 1905, correctly gauged the situation when he said:

"The tremendous upheaval of popular feeling which has taken place in Bengal in consequence of the Partition will constitute a landmark in the history of our National progress. . . .A wave of true national consciousness has swept over the province. . . .Bengal's heroic stand against the oppression of a harsh and uncontrolled bureaucracy has astonished and gratified all India, and her sufferings have not been endured in vain, when they

have helped to draw closer all parts of the country in sympathy and aspiration."

The Bengalis openly defied the Government and sought to exert pressure upon it by the adoption of such political weapons as the boycott of British goods, *Swadeshi* (use of indigenous goods), and the spread of National Education. The Congress, held in 1906, not only endorsed these plans, but, for the first time in its history, laid down as its goal "the system of government obtaining in the self-governing British colonies" which the President summed up in one word, "*Swarāj*". The new spirit reflected in these changes was sponsored by Tilak, Bepin Chandra Pāl, Lājpat Rāi and other "extremist" leaders. But the "moderate" leaders like Surendranath Banerjea, Pheroze Shah Mehta, and Gokhale did not keep pace with it, and there was an open split between the two parties in the Surat session of the Congress in 1907. For nine years the Extremist section kept out of the Congress.

Much happened during these eventful years. Lord Curzon's policy of distintegrating Bengal and of brushing aside the claims of the Indian educated classes to be the prophets of what they themselves spoke of as the "New Nationalism" bore fruit. In 1906 Nawab Salimulla of Dacca set up a permanent political organization of the Muslims, known as the Muslim League, which supported the Partition of Bengal and opposed the boycott of British goods. The Government launched a campaign of repression. Large numbers of the people of Bengal, and also their sympathisers outside, including Tilak, were tried and imprisoned and, under an old regulation of 1818, some of the leaders were deported without trial. Peaceful pickets were beaten and sent to jail, meetings were broken up by the police with *lathi* charges, and popular outbreaks were suppressed with severity. These measures failed to check the nationalist movement. On the contrary, they gave rise to an underground conspiracy to terrorise the Government by killing officials. Bombs were secretly prepared in the outskirts of Calcutta, and the "anarchist movement", as it came to be called, became a new factor in Indian politics. The Government sought to bring the situation under control by passing a number of repressive laws which severely restricted the right of holding public meetings, laid down a heavy penalty for possessing materials for manufacture of bombs, changed the system of trial for facilitating conviction, and armed the Executive with almost unlimited powers over individual persons and political organizations. The Indian Press Act of 1910 laid down heavy fines and forfeiture of press for seditious publications, which were defined in such wide terms as to include almost any independent critics of the Government. Books, newspapers, or other documents containing "Prohibited" matter were to be forfeited. The public life was thoroughly stifled by imposing restrictions on public meetings and press, and rendering impartial justice almost impossible. The Government also prosecuted quite a large number of persons, the punishments inflicted being almost always severe and in many cases vindictive. Even Lord Morley, the Secretary of

State for India, characterized the sentences as "indefensible", "outrageous," and "monstrous".

As the repressive policy failed in its objective, the Government sought to "rally the Moderates" by granting the Morley-Minto Reforms in 1909 (p. 901) and modifying the Partition of Bengal two years later (p. 914). The Moderates were at first jubilant, but some of the regulations under the 1909 Reforms, especially the creation of separate electorates for Muslims, were strongly disapproved by most of them. In fact, this policy, which was regarded as one of "divide and rule", alienated the Moderates from the Government and paved the way for their union with the Radical section of the Congress at the Lucknow session in 1916.

The introduction of the separate electorate has an interesting history. It was a device adopted by the new Viceroy, Lord Minto,[1] to win over the Muslims and set them against the Congress movement. A deputation of the Muslims, encouraged by the British officials, if not by the Government itself, was induced to ask for representation as a separate community, and further pray "that their position should be estimated not merely on their numerical strength but in respect to the political importance of their community and the service it has rendered to the Empire". Lord Minto conceded both, and we know from an entry in Lady Minto's diary of 1st October, 1906, that this act was jubilantly hailed by British officialdom as "nothing less than the pulling back of 62 millions of people from joining the ranks of seditious oppositions". Even the great Liberal statesman Lord Morley supported this ingenious device of "separate electorate" and "weightage" which was virtually a stab in the back at Indian Nationalism.

Ramsay MacDonald, who later became the Prime Minister of Britain, correctly diagnosed the situation when he observed that "the Mahomedan leaders are inspired by certain Anglo-Indian officials, and these officials have pulled wires at Simla and in London, *and of malice aforethought* sowed discord between Hindu and Mahomedan communities by showing the Muslims special favour".

The Muslim League, founded in 1906 (p. 968), was orignally mainly an

[1]According to the Countess of Minto (*India, Minto and Morley*, p. 20 n), separate electorates were proposed by Mr. Gokhale. She does not, however, quote any authority in support of her statement. The following summary of a speech by Mr. Gokhale probably represents his real views:

"Mr. Gokhale stated his own position in the matter quite frankly. He had all along been in favour of special separate electorates for important minorities, but he wanted such electorates to provide not the whole of the representation to which the communities were entitled, but only so much of it as was necessary to redress the deficiencies and inequalities of general elections; and he wanted the same treatment to be extended to other important minorities than Mahomedans where necessary. Mr. Gokhale held strongly that in the best interest of their public life and for the future of their land they must first have elections on a territorial basis in which all communities without distinction of race or creed should participate, and then special separate supplementary elections should be held to secure the fair and adequate representation of such important minorities as had received less than their full share in the general elections." *Speeches of Gopal Krishna Gokhale* (Natesan & Co), p. 1138.

organization of some Muslims who emphasized the bond of religion in place of the "New Nationalism". Its attitude was at first exclusive, but as its numbers grew, it imbibed the nationalistic spirit which animated the country. In 1913 it adopted "self-government within the Empire" as its goal. The war between Turkey and Britain aroused strong anti-British feelings among powerful sections of Muslims and paved the way for co-operation between them and the Congress. Both the Congress and the League held their sessions at Lucknow in 1916, and concluded the famous "Lucknow Pact" by which the Congress agreed to separate electorates and the two organizations jointly framed a constitutional scheme on the basis of Dominion Status.

The year 1916 which saw the union of the Moderate and Radical sections of the Congress, and the friendly co-operation between it and the Muslim League for the common cause of India, is also memorable for the inauguration of two Home Rule Leagues, one founded by Lokamānya Tilak in April of that year, and another by Annie Besant five months later. These two bodies co-operated in carrying on an intensive propaganda in favour of the Congress-League Scheme" of political reforms.

2. The Non-Co-operation and Civil Disobedience Movement (1917–1934)

The War of 1914–1918 which brought about the rapprochement between the Congress and the Muslim League also furthered the Indian cause in other ways. Indian soldiers rendered splendid service to the Empire at critical moments of the war. In acknowledging it Lord Birkenhead truly remarked: "Without India the war would have been immensely prolonged, if indeed without her help it could have been brought to a victorious conclusion." England felt bound to recompense this service by political reforms in India, particularly as one of the avowed objects of the war was to secure self-determination for subject peoples and to make the world safe for democracy. Besides, the lessons of the Russian Revolution and the collapse of the Tsarist regime probably had some effect on a section of British politicians. All these factors led to the famous announcement of 1917 (p. 903) and the constitution of 1919 to which reference has been made earlier (p. 903).

The publication of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report created a split in the ranks of the Congress. It was considered in a special session of the Congress and condemned as inadequate, disappointing and unsatisfactory. Thereupon most of the leaders of the Moderate Party left the Congress, and later founded the Indian Liberal Federation. Mahātmā Gāndhi was at first inclined to try to make the reforms work, and the Congress decided in favour of this in December, 1919. But he changed his views before a year was over. Under his inspiration the Congress adopted, in a special session held in Calcutta in September, 1920, the famous resolution on Non-co-opera-

tion which recommended the renunciation of Government titles and the boycotting of the Legislatures, law-courts and Government educational institutions leading up at a later date to the non-payment of taxes. Further, the object of the Indian National Congress was now defined as the attainment of *Swārajya* (self-rule) by all legitimate and peaceful means. This last phrase replaced the words "constitutional means", and *Swārajya* was taken to imply "self-rule within the Empire, if possible; without, if necessary".

The new policy was acclaimed with enthusiasm, and received overwhelming support from the masses. As a British writer has observed, Gāndhijī "not only converted the nationalist movement into a revolutionary movement, but also made it popular". The Congress gave up its old methods of constitutional agitation, and it was now broad-based on the willing support of the masses. This great change was helped by some contemporary events, two of which deserve special mention, viz. the atrocities in the Punjab and the Khilafat agitation.

In 1919 the Government passed a set of new coercive measures, known as the Rowlatt Acts from the name of the President of the Committee on whose report they were based. These sought to perpetuate the extraordinary repressive powers conferred on the Government during the war, for doing away with ordinary legal procedure and for authorising imprisonment without trial. Gāndhijī organised a passive resistance movement in protest, and "a mighty wave of mass demonstrations, strikes, unrest and rioting spread over many parts of India". The Government put down the movement with a heavy hand, the blackest stain on its record being in connection with a prohibited meeting of citizens at an enclosed place called Jālianwāllā Bāgh at Amritsar. Troops under General Dyer fired 1,600 rounds of ammunition into the unarmed crowd who had no means of exit. Even according to official estimates 379 persons were killed, and 1,200 wounded were left untended. Martial law was proclaimed in the Punjab; and the subsequent inquiries revealed a gruesome picture of shootings, hangings, bombing from the air and extremely severe sentences passed by the tribunals during the reign of terror.

The part played by Britain in the defeat of Turkey and the dismemberment of the Turkish empire in the First World War offended the religious and historical sentiment of the Muslims, and caused them to adopt an aggressive anti-British attitude. The two brothers, Muhammad Ali and Shaukat Ali, and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad organized a mass movement of the Muslims known as the Khilafat movement.

There was already widespread unrest among the industrial workers. The Bombay Mill strike affected more than 125,000 workers at the beginning of 1919 and there were no fewer than 200 strikes involving 15 lakhs of workers during the first six months of 1920. The atrocities in the Punjab stirred the whole country, and in the Khilafat movement Gāndhijī saw "an opportunity

of uniting Hindus and Mahomedans as would not arise in a hundred years". He wholeheartedly espoused the Khilafat cause, and there was, as an official publication recorded, "unprecedented fraternisation between the Hindus and the Muslims".

Gāndhijī conceived the idea of canalising the powerful currents of this united mass movement so as to give the utmost impetus to the national struggle for independence. This took shape in the non-violent non-co-operation movement mentioned above. It was first adopted, though not without opposition, in the special session of the Congress held in Calcutta in September, 1920, and was reaffirmed, almost unanimously, at the annual session at Nāgpur in December, 1920.

The movement evoked a hearty response throughout the country. Nearly two-thirds of the voters abstained from taking part in the election to the Councils held in November, 1920, and a large number of students came out of schools and colleges. The lawyers who gave up their practices included such distinguished persons as Desabandhu C. R. Das and Pandit Motilāl Nehru. An important feature of the movement was the burning of English cloths on bonfires, and a spirit of civil disobedience and passive resistance against the Government was visible everywhere. As there were nearly 30,000 political prisoners, the jail lost its terror, and imprisonment became a badge of honour. The British Government brought the Prince of Wales to India in the vain hope of rousing the traditional feeling of loyalty among the masses. But a *hartāl* was observed all over India on the day (17th November, 1921) the Prince landed in Bombay, and he had to pass for the most part through deserted streets when he visited the provincial capitals of India.

The year 1921 was thus a memorable landmark in the history of India's struggle for freedom. The Congress, in its annual session at Ahmādābād (December,1921) not only expressed its determination to continue the programme of non-violent non-co-operation with greater vigour but took steps to organize civil disobedience.

Mahātmā Gāndhi was appointed by the Congress the sole executive authority to lead the national movement. The popular enthusiasm rose to fever heat and there was an eager expectation of a mass movement on a big scale. Gāndhijī, however, decided to confine it at first at Bardoli, a small district of 87,000 people. But even this was suspended on account of an outbreak of mob violence at Chauri Chaurā (a small village near Gorakhpur in the U.P) in the course of which a police station was burnt and twenty-two policemen killed. Gāndhijī's decision was received with feelings of dismay all over the country, but was endorsed by the Congress Working Committee on 12th February, 1922. In consequence some activities of the national movement had to be suspended for several years.

A new policy was adopted by a section of the Congress under the leadership of C. R. Das and Motilāl Nehru. They organized the Swarājya party and contested the next elections to the Council with a view to wrecking the reforms

from within by "uniform, consistent and continuous obstruction". But in spite of some success the policy failed in its main objective.

The spirit of frustration caused by the suspension of the mass movement adversely affected the relations between Hindus and Muslims. There was no common programme to bring them together, and the transformation of Turkey into a secularist State under Kemal Pasha put an end to the Khilafat movement. Other causes were also at work, and designing persons were not wanting to sow discord between the two communities. A series of communal riots broke out in 1923, and with occasional intervals continued to be almost regular features of Indian political life. The failure of the Swarājya Party was largely due to this communal discord. The Muslim League grew in power and revived the old ideas of Sir Syed Ahmad. The Congress, however, was obsessed by an uncompromising nationalist outlook, took no real measure of the magnitude and character of the communal problem, and underestimated the power and position of the Muslim League, reinforced by some Khilafat leaders who no longer took their inspiration from the Mahātmā The Congress wanted to rally the Muslim Nationalists as a counterpoise to League, very much as the British Government wanted to rally the Moderates against the Extremists. The result was the same, for in the long run both proved equally incapable of stemming the tide of their opponents' sweeping success.

The boycott of the Simon Commission (p. 907), provided a great opportunity for the restoration of amity between the different communities and political parties. The Congress, the Muslim League, and the Liberal Federation, the organization of the Moderates who seceded from the Congress after 1920, all combined to frame a constitution for India. But the All-Parties Convention which met towards the end of 1928 would not concede the claims made by Mr. Jinnah on behalf of the Muslims. He therefore joined the Muslim leaders who did not see eye to eye with the Congress, and on 1st January, 1929, held an All-India Muslim Conference which issued a manifesto of Muslim claims. This formed the basis of the famous fourteen demands formulated by Mr. Jinnah later in the same year.

In the Madras session held in 1927 the Congress had declared complete national independence as its goal. Nevertheless the All-Parties Convention, and later the Congress, agreed to accept Dominion Status if granted on or before 31st December, 1929. Failing this the Congress resolved to pursue its goal of complete independence and organize non-violent non-co-operation including non-payment of taxes.

In reply to the Congress demands the Viceroy, Lord Irwin, declared on 31st October, 1929, that "the natural issue of India's constitutional progress" was the attainment of Dominion Status, and further announced that a Round Table Conference of all parties would be held in London to discuss the recommendations of the Simon Commission. As this fell far short of its demands, the Congress, in its Lahore session, held in December, 1929, declared

complete independence as its goal, resolved to boycott the Legislatures and the Round Table Conference, and took steps to launch a programme of civil disobedience. As the clock struck midnight on 31st December, 1929, Pandit Jawaharlāl Nehru, the President of the Congress, hoisted the National Flag of India. Independence Day was celebrated all over India on 26th January, 1930. This day, on which the solemn ceremony was repeated year after year, became a landmark in the history of India's struggle for freedom.

Gāndhijī started the Civil Disobedience campaign on 6th April, by his famous march to Dandi in Western India to make salt on the sea-shore in defiance of the salt-law regulations. On 12th March, 1930, he left the Sabarmati Ashram on foot with about 79 male and female members and covered the distance of 241 miles in 24 days. Throughout the long journey Gāndhijī received homage and ovation which an Emperor could envy. The villagers flocked from all sides, sprinkled the roads, strewed leaves on them, and as the pilgrims passed sank on their knees. It was veritably a triumphal procession and served as the signal for a mass movement on a large scale, involving mass strikes, the boycott of British goods, grave cases of terrorism such as the armoury raid in Chittāgong, and the setting up of "parallel" governments in several places. The Government adopted stern measures of repression. According to official figures there were 29 cases of firing resulting in 103 killed and 420 injured, and 60,000 people were imprisoned in less than a year. Indiscriminate and merciless beating of men and women formed a feature of the repressive campaign undertaken by the Government.

The strike and the boycott hit the British community hard, and the Government, unable to suppress the movement by force, adopted conciliatory measures. The Round Table Conference which met in November, 1930, without any representative of the Congress, was adjourned on 2nd January, 1931, and on 5th March the famous Gāndhi-Irwin agreement was signed. By this the Congress agreed to give up Civil Disobedience and join the Round Table Conference, while the Government withdrew the repressive ordinances and released political prisoners excepting those guilty of violence.

Gāndhijī was chosen as the sole representative of the Congress at the second session of the Round Table Conference (7th September to 1st December, 1931). But the communal question proved a baffling problem, and as no agreement was possible between Indian leaders, the Prime Ministers, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, had to make the famous Communal Award. On his return to India on 28th December, 1931, Gāndhijī found Government repression in full swing. His request for an interview with the Viceroy was refused, and on 1st January, 1932, the Working Committee of the Congress adopted a resolution for the renewal of Civil Disobedience and the boycott of British goods. On 4th January, Gāndhijī was arrested. The Government declared the Congress to be an illegal body and issued a number of repressive

ordinances. They were openly defied, and the Government took severe measures against the resistance movement. According to Congress estimates more than 120,000 persons were arrested by the end of March, 1933, and a dismal record of "wholesale violence, physical outrages, shooting and beating up, punitive expeditions, collective fines on villages and seizure of lands and property of villagers" is found in the India League Delegation Report issued in 1933.

It was at this unhappy juncture that the British Government announced its constitutional proposals (p. 908). The establishment of a separate electorate for the Depressed Classes, which formed a part of the Communal Award given by Ramsay MacDonald in August, 1932, provoked Gāndhijī, then in jail, to undertake a fast. The result was the Poona Pact (24th September), which nearly doubled the number of seats reserved for the Depressed Classes, to be filled by a common joint electorate out of a panel of names originally chosen by them alone.

3. The Final Phase (1935–1947)

The Civil Disobedience campaign dragged on till May, 1934, when it was virtually abandoned by the Congress. Once more the Congress decided, as in 1922, to work the reforms introduced by the Act of 1935 to which reference has been made above (p. 908). It swept the polls in elections held at the beginning of 1937 so far as the General or predominantly Hindu seats were concerned. The Muslims desired to form a Coalition Ministry with the Congress in each Province, but the Congress refused to admit into the Ministry any one who did not subscribe to its creed. This decision widened the cleavage beween the Congress and the Muslim League, and Mr. Jinnah, who had hitherto been favourably disposed towards the Congress, and had once vehemently protested against the view that India was not a nation,[1] publicly declared that the " Muslims can expect neither justice nor fair play under Congress Government". This sentiment was now shared by the majority of Muslims. Mr. Jinnah became the unquestioned leader of the Muslim community, and was elected each year as President of the League, which soon rallied round it the great bulk of Muslims all over India.

The Congress formed Ministries in seven[2] out of eleven provinces. As their administration was highly successful, the Congress rapidly grew in popularity, its membership increasing from less than half a million at the beginning of 1936 to five million by the end of 1939. But soon a "left wing"

[1] *Modern Review*, Oct. 1925, p. 462.

[2] This does not include Sind, which had also become a Congress Province as the Ministers and the majority of members of its Legislative Assembly had identified themselves with the Congress policy.

developed in the Congress, and its great strength became manifest when its leader Subhās Chandra Bose defeated even Gāndhijī's nominee for the Presidency. When the moderate section ultimately forced Subhās Bose to resign, he formed a new party, the "Forward Bloc", and this open split considerably weakened the power and prestige of the Congress.

Nevertheless the Congress Ministries successfully worked the reforms, and the political situation was fairly tranquil until the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939, when the Congress took exception to the fact that India was dragged into the war without her consent. A strong declaration was issued by the Working Committee of the Congress refusing "co-operation in a war which is conducted on imperialist lines". The Committee also asked the British Government to state whether their war aims included the elimination of imperialism and the treatment of India as a free nation. As no satisfactory reply was forthcoming, all the Congress Ministries resigned in October–November, 1939. When the Germans were carrying everything before them, the Congress offered more than once to co-operate in the war effort, if at least a Provisional National Government were set up at the Centre. The utmost concession on the side of the Government was contained in the Viceroy's statement of 8th August, 1940. He refused to concede the National Government as "its authority is denied by large and powerful elements in India's national life," which obviously referred to the Muslims. But he offered (1) to set up, after the war, a representative body to devise a new constitution for India; (2) to enlarge the Viceroy's Executive Council by nominating additional Indian members; and (3) to appoint a "War Advisory Council" consisting of representatives of British India and Indian States.

The Congress regarded this "August offer" as quite unsatisfactory, and inaugurated, in October, 1940, an individual Civil Disobedience campaign under the leadership of Mahātmā Gāndhi.

This deadlock continued for a year and a half. At last when the Japanese, after overrunning Malaya, were rapidly advancing in Burma, the British made a conciliatory gesture. On 8th March, 1942, Rangoon fell, and three days later it was announced that Sir Stafford Cripps, a member of the British Cabinet, would be sent out to India. Cripps virtually repeated the August offer. He promised Dominion Status and a constitution-making body after the war was over, but held out no hope of any immediate change in the government of India. The Congress as well as the Muslim League refused his offer, and the Cripps Mission (March–April, 1942) ended in complete failure.

Throughout these negotiations the Congress could not count on the support of the Muslim League. Mr. Jinnah now repudiated the "democratic system of Parliamentary government on the conception of a homogeneous nation and the method of counting heads" as impossible in India, and publicly expressed the view that neither minority safeguards nor separate electorates could save the Muslims from the Congress *rāj* at the centre. When the

Congress Ministries in the Provinces resigned, the Muslim League observed a day of deliverance and thanksgiving throughout India.

In January, 1940, Mr. Jinnah declared that the Hindus and Muslims formed two separate nations "who both must share the governance of their common motherland". Three months later, in the Lāhore Session of the Muslim League (March, 1940), he declared that the Muslim nation must have a separate independent state. In other words, he now advocated the establishment of Pakistān or a federation of the Punjab, North-West Frontier or Afghān Province, Kāshmīr, Sind and Baluchistān[1] in a sovereign state. The idea had been first brought into prominence by a group of young Muslims at the time of the Round Table Conference, but had found no support, and was characterised by Muslim leaders as "a student's scheme", "chimerical and impracticable". Even the modified proposal of Sir Muhammad Iqbāl for a loose federation of Pakistān, comprising one or two Muslim states, with the rest of India, first made in 1930, and repeated in 1939, had not been widely accepted.[2] The idea of Pakistān as a sovereign state was revived by Mr. Jinnah, and was formally endorsed by the Muslim League in 1940. From that date all attempts at reconciliation between the Congress and the League foundered on this issue of Pakistān. The Government could also now plausibly refuse the Congress demand for a national government on the ground that the Muslims were opposed to it.

On 8th August, 1942, the All-India Congress Committee adopted a resolution in favour of starting a mass struggle on the widest possible scale. Although the Congress had not made any actual preparations, the Government decided to strike immediately. In the early hours of the morning of August 9, all the Congress leaders were arrested and the Congress was declared an illegal body. As there was no definite organization and a complete lack of leadership, violent riots and assaults and sporadic disorders, such as the cutting of telegraph and telephone lines, damaging railway tracks, stations, etc., occurred on a large scale in different parts of India. The Government again adopted strong measures of repression including firing from aeroplanes. According to official estimates more than 60,000 people were arrested, 18,000 detained without trial, 940 killed, and 1,630 injured through police or military firing during the last five months of 1942.

The outward manifestation of unrest in India was considerably reduced by these repressive measures, but the British Government was soon faced by another serious danger. Subhās Chandra Bose, who had escaped from India in 1941, made contacts with Germany and Japan. When the Japanese

[1]The name Pakistān (originally Pakstān), which means "sacred land", is derived by taking the initial letters of the first four and the end of the last name (R. Coupland, *The Constitutional Problem in India*, Part II, p. 199).

[2]It is, however, to be noted that some time before April, 1925, Lālā Lājpat Rāi had suggested the creation of Muslim Provinces in the north-east and north-west of India to set at rest the ceaseless Hindu-Muslim bickerings and jealousies in some provinces (*Mod. Rev*, April, 1925, p. 489).

conquered the Malay Peninsula, a large number of Indian soldiers fell prisoners into their hands. Under an agreement with the Japanese Government, Bose, now called Netājī (Leader) organised them into an *Azad Hind Fouz* or Indian National Army. He inaugurated the Government of Free India at Singapore, and in 1943 his soldiers advanced with the Japanese army up to the very frontier of India.

On 6th May, 1944, Gāndhijī was released from prison on grounds of health. He held a series of discussions with Mr. Jinnah but no agreement was reached. Lord Wavell, who succeeded Lord Linlithgow as Governor-General in October, 1943, flew to London in March, 1945, and came back with the proposal that the Members of his Council, with the exception of the Viceroy and Commander-in-Chief, should be Indians selected from amongst the leaders of Indian political parties, on a basis of parity between Muslims and the so-called caste Hindus. He summoned a conference at Simla on 25th June, 1945, to select the personnel, but it broke down as the Congress and the League could not come to an agreement.

Not long after this, the Labour Party came into power in Britian. The new British Government made an earnest effort to end the political deadlock in India. They decided to hold fresh elections of Indian Councils, both Central and Provincial, to reconstitute the Viceroy's Executive Council, immediately after the elections, with Indian members as proposed in March, and to summon a constitution-making body as soon as possible. The elections held at the beginning of 1946 resulted in a sweeping victory for the Congress in respect of the General seats and for the Muslim League in respect of Muslim seats.

The Indian National Army organized by Bose surrendered to the British after the collapse of Japan, and a number of its officers were tried in India for treason. This was a highly impolitic step on the part of the Government, as it gave the Indian people a complete picture of an organization of which they had hitherto known very little. A wave of enthusiasm swept the country, and demonstrations were held in a number of cities. On 18th February, 1946, the ratings of the Royal Indian Navy rose in open mutiny which, for a few days, assumed serious proportions.

On 19th February, the British Prime Minister announced that three members of the Cabinet would visit India "to promote, in conjunction with the leaders of Indian opinion, the early realisation of full self-government in India". Later, on 15th March, he referred to complete independence as a possible goal of Indian constitutional development, if Indians so chose. The Cabinet Mission arrived at Delhi in March, 1946, and held a series of conferences with the leaders of the Congress and the League. As no agreement was possible between them, the Mission issued a statement on 16th May, 1946, giving in broad outline their idea of the future government of India and laying down the procedure for framing a detailed constitution.

The Cabinet Mission recommended a federal type of government for the

whole of India including the States. The Federal Government would deal with Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communication, and the other powers would be vested in the Provinces and States. British India was to be divided into three groups of Provinces; one comprising the Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistān; a second comprising Bengal and Assam; and the third the rest. The Union Constitution was to be framed by a Constituent Assembly of 296 members elected on a communal basis by the Provincial Legislative Assemblies, and the representatives of States which joined the Union, while the representatives of the three groups of Provinces were to meet separately to draw up the constitution of the Provinces in each group. Each Province was given the right to opt out of the Federal Union after the first election of its Legislative Council under the new Constitution. The Cabinet Mission further recommended the establishment of an interim National Government by the reconstitution of the Viceroy's Executive Council from among the leaders of the different parties.

On 6th June, the Muslim League accepted the Cabinet Mission's proposals reiterating that the attainment of the goal of a complete sovereign Pakistān still remained the unalterable objective of the Muslims in India. The Congress rejected the Viceroy's proposal for an interim Government, but agreed to participate in the Constituent Assembly in order to frame the Constitution. The Cabinet Mission left India on 29th June.

The Muslim League demanded that the Viceroy should proceed with his scheme for an interim Government even though the Congress would not take part in it. This the Viceory refused to do, for he had already declared that it was to be a Government of all the parties who had accepted the Cabinet Missions plan. There were also sharp differences between the Muslim League and the Congress over the interpretation of the Cabinet Mission's plan.

After a somewhat acrimonious controversy the Muslim League formally withdrew its acceptance of the Cabinet Mission's plan. The Viceroy thereupon, in accordance with his previous declaration, reconstituted his Executive Council without any representative of the League. This complete triumph of the Congress provoked a violent reaction among separatist Muslims, and the Muslim League fixed upon 16th August, 1946, as the day of "Direct Action." On that day, while some of the supporters of the League contented themselves with demonstrations of a peaceful type, a rowdy section in Calcutta got completely out of control. A number of Hindus were killed and their houses and shops were looted and burnt. Soon the Hindus retaliated and for a number of days the streets of Calcutta were the scene of communal riots of the worst type. Neither the League Ministry, nor the Governor and the Viceroy, who were ultimately responsible for law and order, took adequate steps to stop the hideous violence that disgraced the name of the first city of modern India.

On 2nd September, Pandit Jawaharlāl Nehru and his colleagues were

sworn in as members of the Viceroy's Executive Council. Soon after this, the Hindus of a number of villages in the district of Noakhāli and the adjoining part of Comillā suffered terribly from raids organised by bands of armed men belonging to the other community. This provoked reprisals in Bihār, where large numbers of Muslims received the same treatment at the hands of the Hindus. Pandit Nehru flew to Bihār, and the Congress Minister there took vigorous steps to suppress the disturbances.

The Executive Council of the Viceroy, under the guidance of Nehru, worked like a cabinet and changed the whole spirit and outlook of Indian government. Lord Wavell, whose power thus became almost non-existent, now sought to bring in the League members as a counterpoise in the name of communal parity. He told Pandit Nehru that the League had agreed to join the Constituent Assembly, and reconstituted the Executive Council by including members of that organisation. The introduction of this new element destroyed the team spirit of the Council, as the League members openly repudiated the idea of collective responsibility. What was worse, the League did not join the Constituent Assembly, and Mr. Jinnah made the startling disclosure that it had never agreed to do so. It was an awkward situation for the Viceroy, and the British Government did nothing to improve it when it declared, on 6th December, that if the Muslim League did not join the Constituent Assembly, the decision of this body could not be implemented by the British Government, so far at least as it affected the Provinces with a Muslim majority. Nevertheless, the Constituent Assembly met on 9th December, 1946, without the members of the League. Babu Rājendra Prasād was elected President, and various committees were appointed to draft the different parts of the Constitution.

The tense atmosphere continued till 20th February, 1947, when the British Government made an important announcement of policy. It declared its intention to quit India by June, 1948, and appointed Lord Mountbatten Viceroy of India to arrange for the transfer of authority from British to Indian hands.

This momentous proclamation evoked hearty enthusiasm all over India, save in the ranks of the Muslim League, which once more resorted to "Direct Action". Riots broke out all over the Punjab and soon extended to the North-West Frontier Province, and lootings, arson, murder and violence occurred on a large scale over a wide area. These successive communal outbreaks had a very unfortunate consquence. The Hindus and the Sikhs, who had hitherto been strongly in favour of a United India, now gradually came to realise its impracticability, and demanded partition of the Punjab and Bengal if the Muslims refused to join the Constituent Assembly.

Lord Mountbatten assumed office as Viceroy on 24th March, 1947, and on 3rd June broadcast the famous declaration laying down " the method by which power will be transferred from British to Indian hands ". The main points of this new procedure or policy may be summed up as follows:

1. If the areas with a majority of Muslim population so desired, they should be allowed to form a separate Dominion, and a new Constituent Assembly would be set up for that purpose. But in that case there would be a partition of Bengal and the Punjab if the representatives of the Hindu majority disricts in the Legislatures of those Provinces so desired.

2. A referendum would be taken in the North-West Frontier Province to ascertain whether it should join Pakistān or not.

3. The district of Sylhet would be joined to the Muslim area in Bengal after the views of the people had been ascertained by a referendum.

4. Boundary Commissions would be set up to define the boundaries of the Hindu and Muslim Provinces in Bengal and the Punjab.

5. Legislation would be introduced in the current session of Parliament for immediately conferring Dominion Status on India (or the two Dominions if partition is decided upon), without any prejudice to the final decision of the Constituent Assembly (or Assemblies) in this respect.

This historic pronouncement was received with mixed feelings by the public. The Hindus and nationalists of all persuasions deplored the vivisection of India, while the Muslims of the League were not fully satisfied with the " truncated and moth-eaten Pakistān ", as Mr. Jinnah once described it.

It was, however, generally agreed that the new scheme offered the best practicable solution of the Indian problem, so far as it could be envisaged at the moment. Accordingly both the Congress and the League accepted it, and the partition of the Punjab and Bengal was effected by two Commissions appointed by the British Government, with Sir Cyril Radcliffe as Chairman of both. The India Independence Bill, passed by the British Parliament on 1st July, 1947, without any dissent, fixed upon 15th August, 1947, as the date of the transfer of authority. Accordingly, at mid-night on 14th–15th August, a special session of the Constituent Assembly was held in Delhi. It solemnly declared the independence of India as a part of the British Commonwealth and appointed Lord Mountbatten the first Governor-General of the new Indian Dominion.

Mr. Jinnah was chosen as the first Governor-General of Pakistān, which soon took steps to summon its own Constituent Assembly.

15th August, 1947, which saw the end of the long-drawn National Struggle against British rule is a red-letter day in the history of India, and the date will ever remain engraved in the hearts of millions of her people.

APPENDIX I

THE INDIAN STATES IN NEW INDIA

1. General Policy

THE position of the Indian States in Independent India was foreshadowed by the Cabinet Mission, which used the following words in its statement of 16th May, 1946: " It is quite clear that with the attainment of independence by British India, whether inside or outside the Commonwealth, the relationship which has hitherto existed between the Rulers of the States and the British Crown, will no longer be possible. Paramountcy can neither be retained by the British Crown nor transferred to the new Government.... At the same time the States are ready and willing to co-operate in the new development of India. The precise form which their co-operation will take must be a matter for negotiations during the building-up of the new constitutional structure, and it by no means follows that it will be identical for all the States." The Cabinet Mission recommended that: " (1) There should be a Union of India, embracing both British India and the States, which should deal with the following subjects: Foreign Affairs, Defence, and Communications; and should have the powers necessary to raise the finances required for the above subjects. (2) The States should retain all subjects and powers other than those ceded to the Union."

The position was further elucidated as follows by the Cabinet Mission in its *Memorandum on States' Treaties and Paramountcy* presented to the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes on 22nd May, 1946: " When a new fully self-governing or independent Government or Governments come into being...His Majesty's Government will cease to exercise the powers of Paramountcy. This means that the rights of the States which flow from their relationship to the Crown will no longer exist and that all the rights surrendered by States to the Paramount power will return to the States. Political arrangements between the States on the one side and the British Crown and British India on the other hand, will thus be brought to an end. The void will have to be filled either by the States entering into a federal relationship with the successor Government or Governments in British India, or failing this, entering into particular political arrangements with it or them."

The Rulers of the States agreed to accept the Cabinet Mission's plan.

Their viewpoint was shown as follows in a resolution passed by the Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes on 29th January, 1947: " (1) The entry of the States into the Union shall be on no other basis than that of negotiation, and the final decision will rest with each State...which can only be taken after consideration of the complete picture of the constitution. (2) All the rights surrendered by the States to the Paramount power will return to the States. The proposed Union of India will, therefore, exercise only such functions in relation to the States in regard to Union Subjects as are assigned or delegated by them to the Union. Every State shall continue to retain its sovereignty and all rights and powers except those that have been expressly delegated by it. There can be no question of any powers being vested or inherent or implied in the Union in respect of the States unless specifically agreed to by them. (3) The Constitution of each State, its territorial integrity and the succession of its reigning dynasty in accordance with the law, custom and usage of the State, shall not be interfered with by the Union or any part thereof."

But after the declaration regarding the partition of India some of the bigger States like Travancore and Hyderabad pleaded that they could not accept the original plan to which they had given their assent on the basis of a United India. They even thought that they were entitled to declare their independence in the changed situation, and talked of entering into treaty relations as between one sovereign State and another. The leader of the Muslim League supported this new attitude, but it did not accord with the views of the Congress leaders and other prominent politicians. In a meeting held on 15th June, 1947, the All-India Congress Committee stated that they could not " admit the right of any State in India to declare its independence and to live in isolation from the rest of India ". " Such a declaration," in the opinion of Mahātmā Gāndhi, " was tantamount to a declaration of war against the free millions of India." Pandit Nehru said that " any recognition of any such independence by any foreign power, whichever it may be and whatever it may be, will be considered an unfriendly act ". In a statement of 17th June, 1947, Dr. Ambedkar asserted that according to certain aspects of British Constitutional Law and also International Law, there were some flaws in the Cabinet Mission's memorandum regarding lapse of Paramountcy. His view was that the States " will be sovereign States to the extent they are, but they cannot be independent States so long as they remain under the suzerainty, as they must be, either of the Crown, if India remains a Dominion, or of the successor State, if India becomes independent ".

Sardar Patel took charge of the Indian States Department created by the Government of India, on 5th July, 1947, " to deal with matters arising between the Central Government and the Indian States ". Following his advice as well as that of Lord Mountbatten, all the States, with a few exceptions, decided, on 25th July, to accede to the Indian Union in

accordance with an Instrument of Accession which provided that, pending the promulgation of a constitution by the Constituent Assembly, in which the States would be adequately represented, the Dominion Parliament would legislate for the acceding States in matters relating to Defence, External Affairs, Communications and other ancillary subjects.

The policy of the Government of the Indian Dominion regarding the States proved successful in most cases. Their relations were regulated by two processes. One was the merger of the smaller States either into a unit administered by the Central Government, or into the neighbouring Provincial administrations, as for example the merger of the Eastern States into the Provinces of Orissa and the Central Provinces, and of the Deccan States and the Gujarāt States into the Bombay administration. The other process was that of the integration of a number of States into bigger administrative combinations, as for example the United State of Matsya (18th March, 1948), the United State of Kāthiāwār (Saurāshtra) (15th February, 1948), the United State of Rājasthān (25th March, 1948 and 18th April, 1948), the United State of Vindhya Pradesh (4th April, 1948), the United State of Gwālior, Indore and Mālwā (Madhya Bhārat Union, 28th May, 1948), and the Patiāla and East Punjab States Union (15th July, 1948). The administration of a Union of 21 States, known as Himāchal Pradesh, and of Cutch, together having a total area of 19,061 square miles, passed under the control of the Centre.

There still remained some small States and also a few major States unaffected by the processes mentioned above. Regarding such major States the policy of the Government of the Indian Union was stated in the Dominion Parliament on 15th March, 1948, by Mr. N. V. Gadgil (Indian Minister of Works) speaking on behalf of Sardar Patel: " There is no desire on our part, in any way, to compel or coerce them into merger or integration. If they wish to remain as separate autonomous units, we would have no objection, but if the Rulers and the people of any of these States desire to merge with the neighbouring Province or form a Union with the neighbouring States on a voluntary basis, obviously the Government of India cannot say ' No '....It is clear, however, that in these States, which remain separate units, there would be continuous popular pressure for the grant of full responsible government. I hope the Rulers of these States will appreciate the necessity of retaining the affection and goodwill of their subjects by timely concessions, rather than futile resistance to popular demands....Our policy in regard to them remains....their continued autonomous existence unless both the Rulers and the people desire otherwise."

Along with the modifications in the pattern of an old structure, there took place a considerable transformation of the inner set-up of the States and a reorientation to the attitude and policy of the Rulers towards their peoples. Not only did they introduce various measures for improving the

economic condition of their respective areas, but " practically every State " as the *White Paper on Indian States*, issued by the Government of India in July, 1948, noted, " announced its intention to grant full responsible government, and in a vast majority of them power has already been transferred to the people ". The same document significantly notes that " a bloodless revolution has been brought about, on the one hand, by the operation of democratic forces unleashed by freedom, and on the other, by the patriotic attitude of the Rulers who have been quick to appreciate the change".

The State of Junāgadh and a few adjoining States joined the United State of Kāthiāwār (Saurāshtra) (31st December, 1948). Mayurbhanj merged into Orissa, Kolhāpur into the Bombay Province, and Rāmpur and Banāras into the U.P. Cochin was amalgamated with Travancore. The biggest Union of Indian States, and one of the biggest political and administrative units of India, known as the " Greater Rajasthan Union", was inaugurated on 30th March, 1949. It has within its fold 15 ancient Rājput States with an area of 120,000 sq. miles, a population of about 13 millions, and an annual revenue of about 10 crores of rupees. The great State of Barodā merged into the Bombay Province on 1st May, 1949, and Bhopāl, Cooch Behār, Tripurā, and Manipur passed under the Central administration. Thus before the end of November, 1949, the integration of Indian States was completed with the exception of Hyderābād and Kāshmīr.

2. Hyderābād

A settlement with Hyderābād, which has a special position as the biggest State in India and having a Muslim ruler over a very large Hindu population, raised highly intricate issues. On 29th November, 1947, Hyderābād entered into one year's Standstill Agreement with the Indian Union to maintain the *status quo* which had existed before 15th August, 1947.

In the opinion of Syed Kasim Razvi, President of the *Majlis Ittehad-ul-Muslimin*, the Standstill Agreement in no way interfered with the status of Hyderābād as an independent sovereign State, while Paramountcy was " buried deep once for all ". But the Government of India felt that from considerations of defence, internal security, and economy, India would remain exposed to grave dangers with an independent Hyderabad. " An independent State completely landlocked within the heart of another is," they noted in their White Paper on Hyderābād, " an unheard-of proposition."

Besides this fundamental point of divergence between India and Hyderābād, some newly arisen internal and external factors further complicated the situation. The activities within the State of the *Majlis Ittehad-ul-Muslimin* and of the Razakars under the leadership of Kasim Razvi, and

incidents on the borders of the Indian provinces of Madras, Central Provinces and Bombay, were a standing menace to peace and harmony, and caused much anxiety in the minds of responsible people in different quarters.

All negotiations between Hyderābād and the Indian Union from January, 1948, proved abortive. The Nizam's Government refused to accept the suggestion made by the Governor-General on behalf of the Government of India for Hyderābād's accession to the Indian Dominion, and also another suggestion of the Government of India for the introduction of responsible government in the State. During the final phase of the negotiations in 1948, a Draft Agreement was drawn up. On 18th June, 1948, three days before his departure from India, Lord Mountbatten appealed to the Nizām to accept the Draft Agreement, but to no effect.

On the Hyderābād Government's rejection of the Draft Agreement, the Government of India put some economic pressure on the former. But this did not improve matters. The forces that worked against accession to the Indian Dominion held a position of vantage in that State and made warlike preparations, such as an increase in the State Army, the formation of irregular armies, and the smuggling of arms and ammunition from abroad with the help of foreign adventurers. Further, the growing violence of the Razakars inside Hyderābād State and in the border tracts of the Indian Union seriously menaced law and order. So the Government of India reiterated their demand for immediate disbandment of the Razakars, and also asked the Nizām to facilitate the return of the Indian troops to Secunderābād, where they had been stationed before their withdrawal early that year according to the Standstill Agreement. The Nizām, who had already appealed to the United Nations against India, would not accept these terms. At this the Government of India informed the Nizām's Government in a final letter on 11th September that they now considered themselves free to take whatever action they thought necessary to restore law and order.

The Indian troops marched into the Hyderābād State on 13th September. The Government of India declared that it was not an " act of war " but a mere " police action " intended " to restore peace and tranquillity inside the State and a sense of security in the adjoining Indian territory ". At 4.30 p.m. on 18th September, 1948, Major-General El Edroos, Commander, Forces of the Hyderābād State, surrendered on behalf of the Nizām to Major-General J. N Chaudhury, Commander of the First Armoured Division of the Indian Army. Kasim Razvi was arrested and the Razakar organisation was broken up. The Laik Ali Ministry, which had filed complaint against India before the Security Council, resigned on 17th September, and the Nizām cabled on 22nd September to the effect that he had withdrawn the Hyderābād case from the Security Council and that the delegation sent there by the outgoing Ministry had no authority to represent him or his State.

Restoration of peace and order being considered by the Indian Government the first and foremost need of the hour, the affairs of Hyderābād were placed under the control of Major-General J. N. Chaudhury, as Military Governor, to be assisted by a staff of Civil Officers. The Nizām readily accepted the new situation and offered his full co-operation. Order and tranquillity were gradually established by effective administrative measures. On 26th January, 1950, Hyderābād acceded to the Indian Union. As a result of the reorganization of States in 1956, to which reference will be made later in detail, Hyderābād, as a separate State, has now ceased to exist.

3. Kāshmīr

While the Hyderābād problem seemed to be nearing solution, the situation in the State of Jammu and Kāshmīr remained grave and critical. Situated in the extreme north of the Indian sub-continent, this State covers an area of 84,471 square miles. On the north-east it is bordered by Tibet, on the north by Chinese Turkestān (Sinkiang), and on the north-west by the Soviet Republic of Turkestān and by Afghānistān. On its western border lies Paksitān, and to the south it touches Pakistān and the Dominion of India. The census of 1941 recorded that the total population of the State was 4,021,615, of whom 77·11 per cent were Muslims, 20·12 per cent Hindus, and 2·77 per cent Sikhs and Buddhists. In view of geographical contiguity and the greater numerical strength of the Muslims in this State, Pakistān was naturally anxious to bring it under her influence.

The State of Jammu and Kāshmīr was subjected to repeated tribal raids from across and within the Pakistān area soon after the partition. On the rapid advance of the raiders up the Jhelum Valley Road, threatening even Srinagar, the Government of Jammu and Kāshmīr sought assistance of the Government of the Indian Dominion. On 26th October the Māhārāja of Kāshmīr formally acceded to the Indian Union, and this step was fully approved by Sheikh Muḥammad Abdullah, leader of the All Jammu and Kāshmīr National Conference, an organization, enjoying a large measure of popular confidence and support in the State. The Government of India, while accepting this accession as a provisional step, expressed the view that the future of Kāshmīr should be decided in accordance with the popular will ascertained by means of plebiscite or referendum.

The first contingent of Indian troops reached Kāshmīr by air on the morning of 27th October, 1947. On 31st October, an interim Emergency Administration was formed with Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah as its head, which, with the help of Indian forces, successfully resisted tribal raids, believed to be encouraged and supported by Pakistān, whose sympathies were for the Azad Kāshmīr Government, an organization opposed to the new Government in Kashmir. On 31st December, the Indian Union sent

a memorandum to the Security Council of the United Nations urging the latter " to call upon Pakistān (a member State), to put an end immediately to the giving of such assistance, which is an act of aggression against India". After fruitless efforts at mediation for about five months the United Nations sent a Commission to study things on the spot. This Commission reached India in July, 1948 and on 13th August, 1948, suggested a " Cease Fire " agreement between India and Pakistān. The Indian Union agreed, but the Pakistān Government was not prepared to accept the " Cease Fire " resolution without attaching certain conditions which were unacceptable to the Commission. The presence of Pakistān troops in Kāshmīr territory was now admitted by the Pakistān Government, and the relations between the two Dominions grew extremely strained. Happily good sense ultimately prevailed, and one minute before midnight on 1st January, 1949, a mutual " Cease Fire " agreement was concluded between the Governments of the Indian Union and Pakistān. Hostilities ceased and Admiral Nimitz was appointed U.N. Administrator for the plebiscite. It was hoped that the future of the State of Jammu and Kāshmīr would be determined by a plebiscite held under satisfactory conditions.

In April, 1950, the Security Council appointed Sir Owen Dixon as the U.N. Representative, in place of the U.N. Commission, to help the parties for " the expeditious and enduring solution of the dispute which has arisen between the two Governments in regard to the State of Jammu and Kāshmīr ". But his efforts proved to be of no avail. On his request to be relieved, the Security Council appointed Dr. Frank Graham as U.N. Representative on 30th April, 1951. The latter's efforts were also fruitless.

In 1951 a Constituent Assembly met in Jammu and Kāshmīr to frame a constitution for the State. In February, 1954, the accession of the State to India was ratified by the Constituent Assembly, and in November, 1956, it adopted a constitution legalizing the status of Jammu and Kāshmīr as a unit of the Indian Union. The Constituent Assembly dissolved itself on 26th January, 1957, after the formal inauguration of the new constitution. On 26th July, 1957, Bakhsi Ghulam Mohammad was sworn in as Prime Minister of Jammu and Kāshmīr. Yuvaraj Karan Singh was elected unopposed for another term of office as *Sadar-i-Riyasat* of Jammu and Kāshmīr. Two days before this date, the Security Council passed a resolution calling for a *status quo* in Kāshmīr. A resolution sponsored in the Security Council by four countries—Britain, Australia, Cuba and the U.S.A.—for sending United Nations forces to Kāshmīr for the solution of her problem was vetoed by the U.S.S.R. on 20th February, 1957. The deputation of Gunnar Jarring of Sweden, President of the Security Council, with instructions to explore the possibilities for settlement of the Kāshmīr dispute and report to the Security Council before 30th April, 1957, did not produce any concrete result. The revival of the Graham Commission by a resolution of the Security Council was likewise abortive.

The Kāshmīr problem has been before the Security Council for more than a decade, but no solution has been reached. In the absence of the requisite conditions, and in view of the continuance of Pakistān's aggression in a portion of the State, the question of a plebiscite is now dead so far as the Government of India is concerned. It is significant to note that the Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kāshmīr itself declared the accession of the State to India as final.

On 27th August, 1965, units of the Pakistāni forces invaded Indian territory, after irregular forces had infiltrated into Kāshmīr earlier in the same month. (For fuller details of these events, and of the subsequent Tashkent Declaration, see Appendix III.)

Recently an accord has been reached about which an announcement was made in Parliament by India's Prime Minister and Sheikh Abdullah was sworn in as Chief Minister of Jammu and Kāshmīr on 25th February, 1975. The main features of the accord are:

1. Sheikh Abdullah returns to power after over two decades with the resignation of Syed Mir Qasim who has willingly made way for the Sheikh as party leader.

2. The special status of Jammu and Kāshmīr as guaranteed under Article 370 of the Constitution is to continue. There is to be no amendment of the Constitution to facilitate any change.

3. Neither the State Assembly nor the State unit of the Congress Party is to be dissolved. The Plebiscite Front is to be "reorganized" or may even be dissolved in view of the new political developments. The Sheikh may later seek a mandate from the people, but the plebiscite issue is dead.

4. The accession of Jammu and Kāshmīr to India is not questioned, and Sheikh Abdullah declared that he had accepted the accession as final.

5. To begin with, the Sheikh is to have a small cabinet comprising of Ministers of unquestioned integrity and representing the various regions of Jammu and Kāshmīr.

6. There is to be no repeal of the laws passed after August, 1953 when the Sheikh was removed from office, and therefore, there is to be no return to the pre-1953 position as was earlier demanded by the Sheikh.

By an Act of Parliament, the State of the Indian Union previously known as Punjab was divided into two states—Punjab and Haryana—on 1st November, 1966. According to the North-Eastern Areas (Reorganization) Act, 1971, five States and two Union Territories were created in the north-eastern part of the country. The five new States are: Assam, Meghalaya, Tripura, Manipur, and Nagaland. The two new Union Territories are: Arunachal Pradesh (previously known as NEFA) and Mizoram (earlier called the Mizo Hills District)– the latter was inaugurated as a Union Territory on 21st January, 1972. However, these new units share certain features. For instance, Assam, Meghalaya, Manipur and Tripura have a

common Governor, and these five States and the two new Union Territories have a common High Court.

The reorganization of territories in north-east India was effected to enable the diverse ethnic and linguistic groups who inhabit the area to shape their own destinies without interference and to remove the feeling that they were being exploited by others.

India now has twenty-two States (including Sikkim) and nine Union Territories. The States are: 1. Andhra Pradesh, 2. Assam, 3. Bihar, 4. Gujarat, 5. Kerala, 6. Madhya Pradesh, 7. Tamil Nadu, 8. Mahārāshtrā, 9. Mysore (now Karnataka), 10. Orissa, 11. Punjab, 12. Rājasthān, 13. Uttar Pradesh, 14. West Bengal, 15. Jammu and Kāshmīr, 16. Nagaland, 17. Haryana, 18. Himāchal Pradesh, 19. Manipur, 20. Tripura, 21. Meghalaya, 22. Sikkim. The Union Territories are: 1. Delhi, 2. The Andaman and Nicobar Islands, 3. The Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands, (the name has been changed to Lakshadweep on 1st November, 1973), 4. Dadra and Nagar Haveli, 5. Goa, Daman, and Diu, 6. Pondicherry, 7. Chandigarh, 8. Mizoram, and 9. Arunachal Pradesh.

The Minister of External Affairs, Government of India, Mr. Y. B. Chavan, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Portugal, Dr. Mario Soares, signed at New Delhi on 31st December, 1974, on behalf of the Heads of their respective countries, a Treaty on "recognition of India's sovereignty over Goa, Daman, Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and related matters. Diplomatic relations between the two countries, which had been broken off in 1955, were renewed immediately upon the signature of the Treaty." This Treaty, both believed, buried "20 years of conflict" and established "a basis for friendly co-operation" by the exchange of delegations in economic, technical, and cultural fields.

APPENDIX II

THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

THE Constituent Assembly which first met on 9th December, 1946 (p. 980), took three years to complete its work, and the new Constitution was adopted and signed by the President, Dr. Rājendra Prasād, on 26th November, 1949. The formation of the Sovereign Republic was proclaimed on 26th January, 1950, the twentieth anniversary of Independence Day (p. 974). It is a bulky document covering about 270 pages, and its main provisions, as given below, were:

A. INDIAN UNION

1. India, that is Bhārat, is a Sovereign Democratic Republic[1] and a Union of States. These States are divided into four categories, viz.:

(A) Assam, Bihār, Bombay, Madhya Pradesh (Central Provinces and Berar), Madras, Orissa, Punjab (E. Punjab), the United Provinces,[2] and West Bengal.

(B) Hyderābād, Jammu and Kāshmīr, Madhya Bhārat (p. 984), Mysore, Patiālā and East Punjab States Union, Rājasthān, Saurāshtra, Travancore-Cochin, and Vindhya Pradesh.

(C) Ajmer, Bhopāl, Bilāspur, Coorg, Delhi, Himāchal Prādesh, Kutch, Manipur, and Tripurā.

(D) The Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

The first category consists of the former provinces of British India, while the second and third comprise the old Indian States, either single or integrated into unions, together with three Chief Commissionerships (centrally administered territories) of old, viz. Ajmer-Merwara, Coorg, and Delhi.

[1]But it is still a member of the Commonwealth of Nations. The present status of India is regulated by the "India (Consequential Provision) Bill" passed by the British Parliament, which received the Royal Assent on 16th December, 1949. This Act, while recognizing India as a Republican State, preserves for her the rights and privileges at present enjoyed by the Indians under British law.

[2]The name of this Province was altered to Uttar Pradesh in January 1950.

B. FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

2. The Constitution guarantees to all citizens freedom of speech and expression, the right to assemble peaceably, and freedom of conscience and worship, subject to general considerations of public security and morality.

3. All citizens, irrespective of religion, race, caste, sex, and place of birth, shall enjoy equality before the law and no disability shall be imposed on them in any respect.

" Untouchability " is abolished and its practice in any form is forbidden.

4. No person shall be deprived of his life, property or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. The law may provide for preventive detention of a person for three months and even for a longer period, either on the recommendation of an Advisory Board, or in accordance with a law passed by Parliament.

The law authorizing compulsory acquisition of property should provide for compensation.

C. THE UNION GOVERNMENT

5. The executive power of the Union is vested in the President of India, who is elected for five years by the members of an electoral college consisting of (*a*) the elected members of both Houses of Parliament and (*b*) the elected members of the Legislative Assemblies of the States.

6. There is also a Vice-President of India elected for five years by the members of both Houses of Parliament, assembled at a joint meeting.

7. There is a Council of Ministers with the Prime Minister at the head to aid and advise the President. The Prime Minister is appointed by the President, and the other Ministers are appointed by the President on the advice of the Prime Minister. The Council of Ministers is collectively responsible to the House of the People.

8. There is a Parliament for the Union consisting of the President and two Houses known respectively as the Council of States and the House of People.

9. The Council of States consists of (1) not more than 238 representatives of States, elected by the elected members of the Legislative Assembly of each State, and (2) 12 members nominated by the President on the ground of their having special knowledge or practical experience in literature, science, art, and social service.

10. The House of the People consists of not more than 500 members directly elected by the voters in the States. For this purpose territorial constituencies have been specially created in such a manner that there is not less than one member for every 750,000 of the population and not more than one member for every 500,000 of the population.

11. The Council of States is not subject to dissolution, but one-third of its members retire on the expiration of every second year. The House of the People, unless sooner dissolved, continues for five years. Both the Houses must meet at least twice in every year.

12. The Vice-President of India is the *ex-officio* Chairman of the Council of States, which elects a Deputy Chairman. The House of the People elects its own Speaker and Deputy Speaker. These officers and members of the two Houses receive salaries and allowances as fixed by Parliament.

13. A Money Bill may originate only in the House of the People and is passed even if the Council of States does not agree to it. All other Bills may originate in either House of Parliament, and are deemed to have been passed only when agreed to by both Houses, or, in case of difference, passed in a joint sitting of the two Houses by a majority of the total number of members of both Houses present and voting.

14. The President's assent is necessary before a Bill becomes law, and he may withhold his assent and return the Bill with his suggestions; but if the Bill is passed again by the Houses he cannot withhold his assent.

15. There is a Supreme Court of India consisting of a Chief Justice of India and, until Parliament by law prescribes a larger number, not more than seven other judges. It has original jurisdiction in any dispute between two or more States and between the Government of India and one or more States. An appeal lies to the Supreme Court, from the judgment of any High Court in a State. A judge of the Supreme Court (or of the High Court of a State) shall not be removed from his office except after an address by each House of Parliament passed by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members present and voting.

D. THE STATES (CATEGORY A)

16. There is a Governor for each State appointed by the President for a term of five years and holding office during his pleasure.

17. There is a Council of Ministers with the Chief Minister at the head to aid and advise the Governor. The Chief Minister is appointed by the Governor, and the other Ministers by the Governor on the advice of the Chief Minister. The Council of Ministers is collectively responsible to the Legislative Assembly of the State.

18. There is a Legislature in every State which consists of the Governor and the Legislative Assembly, but there is an additional House, known as the Legislative Council, in Bihār, Bombay, Madras, Punjab, the United Provinces, and West Bengal.

19. The members of the Legislative Assembly are chosen by direct election, on a scale of not more than one member for every 75,000 of the population.

20. The total number of members in the Legislative Council is not to exceed one-fourth of the total number of members in the Legislative Assembly. Of these one-third are elected by the Municipalities, District Boards and other local authorities; one-twelfth by graduates of three years' standing; one-twelfth by teachers of three years' standing; and one-third by the members of the Legislative Assembly. The remainder are nominated by the Governor and consist of persons having special knowledge or practical experience in literature, science, art, the co-operative movement, and social service.

21. The duration of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly is the same as laid down respectively for the Council of States and the House of the People in para. 11.

22. Every Legislative Assembly chooses two of the members respectively as Speaker and Deputy Speaker thereof. Every Legislative Council chooses two of its members respectively as Chairman and Deputy Chairman thereof. These officers as well as the members of the two Houses receive such salaries and allowances as may be fixed by the Legislature of the State.

23. A Money Bill may originate only in the Legislative Assembly, and is passed even if the Legislative Council does not agree to it. All other Bills may originate in either House, and are deemed to have been passed only when agreed to by both Houses. But in case of difference, if the Legislative Assembly passes the Bill a second time, it becomes law without the approval of the Legislative Council.

24. The Governor has the same power of assenting to, or withdrawing his assent from, a Bill passed by the Legislature as is possessed by the President (*vide* para. 14). But the Governor may also reserve such a Bill for the consideration of the President.

E. THE STATES (CATEGORIES B, C, D)

25. The main difference between the States belonging to categories A and B is that while the executive head of the former is a Governor, that of the latter is the Rājapramukh, usually the ruler of the old State (or of one of them in the case of an integration of States). The appointment of the Rājapramukh is regulated by the agreement entered into between each such State and the Government of India. The third and fourth categories of States are administered by the Head of the Indian Union, through a Chief Commissioner appointed by him or through the government of a neighbouring State.

F. THE RELATION BETWEEN THE UNION AND THE STATES

26. Generally speaking, the Parliament may make laws for the whole or any part of India, and the Legislature of a State may make laws for the

whole or any part of the State. But the Constitution specifically lays down three lists of subjects, with respect to the first of which the Parliament, and with respect to the second, the Legislature of the State, has exclusive power to make laws; and both have concurrent powers of legislation in regard to the third.

27. The Union List includes, among others, defence of India, naval, military, and air forces, arms and ammunitions, foreign affairs including diplomatic representation, war and peace, railways, maritime shipping and navigation, airways, posts and telegraphs, currency, trade and commerce, with foreign countries, inter-State trade and commerce, banking, insurance, and financial corporations, regulation of mines and mineral development, regulation of labour, manufacture of salt, High Courts, certain institution of all-India importance, certain taxes like income-tax, duties of customs, and duties of excise.

28. The State List includes, among others, police, administration of justice (except constitution of High Courts), prisons, local government, education, communication (within the State), forests, fisheries, and several taxes.

29. The Concurrent List includes, among others, criminal law, civil and criminal procedure, preventive detention for the security of the State, Trade Unions, ports, inland shipping and navigation, trade, commerce and price-control.

30. The executive power of every State is to be so exercised as to ensure compliance with the laws made by Parliament. It shall not impede or prejudice the exercise of the executive power of the Union which extends to the giving of such directions to a State as may appear necessary to the Government of India.

31. Detailed regulations are laid down for the distribution of revenues between the Union and the States, and provision is made for the appointment of a Finance Commission from time to time to revise such distribution.

G. SUFFRAGE AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP OF LEGISLATURE

32. Every citizen of India, of not less than twenty-one years of age, is entitled to vote in the elections to the House of the People and to the Legislative Assembly of the State to which he belongs.

33. No citizen of less than thirty years of age is qualified for the membership of the Council of States or the Legislative Council; the minimum age for the membership of the House of the People and Legislative Assembly is twenty-five years.

34. For a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution seats shall be reserved in the House of the People for the Scheduled

Castes and Scheduled Tribes, in proportion to their population, and the President may nominate not more than two members of the Anglo-Indian Community to that House.

H. EMERGENCY PROVISIONS

35. The President or the Governor of a State may, when the Houses of Legislature are not in session, promulgate an Ordinance, having the same force and effect as an Act of the Legislature, if he thinks it necessary to take immediate action. Such Ordinances shall cease to operate at the expiration of six weeks from the reassembly of the Legislature, or earlier if the Legislature disapproves of them.

36. If the President is satisfied that a grave emergency exists whereby the security of India or any part of it is threatened, he may issue a Proclamation to that effect. While such a Proclamation of Emergency is in operation, the executive and legislative powers of the Union practically supersede those of the States.

37. If the President is satisfied that a situation has arisen in which the Government of a State cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution, he may, by Proclamation, assume to himself or vest in the Parliament all or any of the powers and functions of the Government of the State.

38. The Proclamation, referred to in the two preceding paras., shall cease to operate at the expiration of two months unless approved by both Houses of Parliament before that date, or in case the House of the People was dissolved at the time, within thirty days of its reconstitution.

I. MISCELLANEOUS

39. Either House of Parliament may bring a charge of Impeachment against the President for violation of the Constitution. If it is passed by a majority of two-thirds, and is also sustained, after due enquiry, by a similar majority of the other House, the President shall be removed from office.

40. Subject to certain general restrictions which the law imposes, trade, commerce, and intercourse throughout the territory of India shall be free.

41. The Constitution provides for the appointment of a Public Service Commission both for the Union and the States, an Attorney-General for India, a Comptroller and Auditor-General of India, as well as Advocate-Generals and High Courts for States.

42. For a period of fifteen years the English language shall continue to be the official language of the Union. Thereafter the official language shall be Hindi in Devanāgari script.

43. The Legislature of a State may by law adopt any local language as its official language provided that the official language of the Union shall be used for communication between two States.

J. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Since 1951 there have been no less than eighteen amendments to the Indian Constitution. The more importnat of these are noted below:

1. Notwithstanding Article 15 of the Constitution the State is now authorized to make "special provision for the advancement of any socially and educationally backward classes of citizens or for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes".

2. The State is authorized to impose reasonable restrictions on the exercise of the right conferred by Article 19, in the interests of the security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States, public order, decency or morality, or in relation to contempt of Court, defamation or incitement to an offence.

3. Important modifications in the provision for compuslory acquisition or requisitioning of property and State Monopolies.

Clause 6 of Article 19 was modified as follows:

"Nothing shall affect the operation of any existing law in so far as it relates to, or prevents the State from making any law relating to--

(i) the professional or technical qualifications necessary for practising any profession or carrying on any trade or business, or

(ii) the carrying on by the State, or by a Corporation owned or controlled by the State of any trade, business, industry or service, whether to the exclusion, complete or partial, of citizens or otherwise.

As the validity of the laws for the abolition of Zamindari was challenged, this amendment sought to place these laws retrospectively beyond challenge in the Courts.

The Constitution (Fourth Amendment) Act of 1955 by amending Articles 31, 31A and 305 of the Constitution authorized the State to acquire or requisition private property compulsorily for a public purpose and barred any reference to a Court of Law regarding the quantum of compensation fixed by the Legislature.

The Constitution (Fifth Amendment) Act of 1955 by amending Article 3 provided that no Bill for the purpose of changing the area or boundaries of States could be introduced in either House of Parliament "except on the recommendation of the President and unless the Bill has been referred by the President to the Legislature of that State for expressing its view thereon" within a specific period.

The Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act of 1956 carried into effect the reorganization of States on the basis of the proposals of a special committee appointed for the purpose. The different categories of States mentioned above were abolished and all the fourteen States were placed on the same footing. Certain territories were characterized as Union Territories to be directly administered by the Centre. There were thus fourteen States and six Union Territories. The six Union Territories were: (1) Delhi, (2) Himāchal Pradesh, (3) Manipur, (4) Tripura (5) The Andaman and Nicobar Islands, (6) Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands. The fourteen States were Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihār, Bombay, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Madras, Mysore, Orissa, Punjab, Rājasthān, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, and Jammu and Kāshmīr. Of the fomer ten Part A States, Assam, Orissa, and Uttar Pradesh have not been territorially affected by this reorganization. There were some boundary readjustments for West Bengal, Bihār and Madras. The Andhra State, as created in 1953 out of the northern part of Madras, was designated Andhra Pradesh, and was enlarged by the merger of the portion of Hyderābād known as Telengāna. Bombay became the largest State in point of area by the merger of Kutch and Saurāshtra and the Marāthī-speaking districts of Madhya Pradesh and Hyderābād. The new Madhya Pradesh, in spite of the loss of Vidarabha or the eight Marāthī-speaking districts, emerged as the second largest State by the addition of Madhya Bharat, Bhopal, and Vindhya Pradesh. The former State of Patiala and East Punjab States Union was added to the Punjab. The Kanarese-speaking districts of Hyderābād were added to Mysore. Travancore-Cochin, with some territorial adjustments, assumed the new name of Kerala. The outstanding features of the reorganisation were (1) the abolition of Rājpramukhs, (2) establishment of zonal councils with advisory capacity in relation to inter-State affairs or border disputes and (3) provision for linguistic safeguards. The Bombay State has been reorganized by the Bombay Reorganization Act which received the assent of the President of India on 25th April, 1960, and it has been divided into two States, viz. the Gujarāt State and the Mahārāshtra State.

According to the Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Act, 1961, the former Portuguese enclaves of Dadra and Nagar Haveli were incorporated within India, their administration being carried on under the rule-making powers of the President.

The Constitution (Eleventh Amendment) Act, 1961, provided for the election of the Vice-President by an Electoral College consisting of members of both the Houses of Parliament. It also amended Article 71 by making it clear that the election of the President or the Vice-President could not be challenged on the ground of any vacancy in the appropriate Electoral College.

According to the Constitution (Twelfth Amendment) Act of 1962, the Portuguese possessions of Goa, Daman and Diu became part of the Indian

territory as from 20th December, 1961, being governed since that date as a Union territory.

By the Constitution (Thirteenth Amendment) Act, 1962, Nagaland was created as the sixteenth State in the Indian Union. Pondicherry, Karikal, Mahe and Yanam became part of Union territory from August, 1962, after the ratification of the Treaty of Cessation by India and France. These territories were specified as a Union territory called "Pondicherry" by the Constitution (Fourteenth Amdenment) Act, 1962. It also provided for new legislatures, on the pattern that prevailed in some of the former States, for the Union Territories of Himāchal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, Goa, Daman and Diu, and Pondicherry.

The Constitution (Fifteenth Amendment) Act of 1963 made the President of India, in consultation with the Chief Justice of India, the final arbiter in a dispute about a High Court Judge's age and shortened the procedure for disciplinary action against Government employees.

The Constitution (Sixteenth Amendment) Act of 1963 amended Article 19 in such a way as to give to the States power to make any law imposing reasonable restrictions on the exercise of fundamental rights in the interest of "sovereignty and integrity" of the country.

The Constitution (Seventeenth Amendment) Act of 1964 enlarged the definition of "estate" and extended protection to various State Land Reforms Acts so that their validity might not be questioned in Courts of Law.

The Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act also dealt with the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, the High Courts and constitutional safeguards for linguistic minorities. Following a treaty concluded between the Government of France and the Government of India, the French territories in India comprising Pondicherry and Karikal on the Coromandel coast, Yanam on the Andhra coast and Mahe on the coast of Kerala were included in the Schedule to the Constitution of India as Union Territory of Pondicherry by the Constitution (Fourteenth Amendment) Act of 1962.

Some significant Amendments have been made in the Constitution of India during the recent years.

The Constitution (Eighteenth Amendment) Act of 1966 provided that in Article 3 of the Constitution the following explanations shall be inserted at the end, namely, Explanation 1—In this article in clauses (a) to (e) "State" includes a Union Territory, but in the proviso "State" does not include a Union Territory. Explanation 2—The power conferred on Parliament by clause (a) includes the power to form a new State or Union Territory by uniting a part of any State or Union Territory to any other State or Union Territory.

This amendment became necessary as the Government acceded to the demand for the creation of a new State out of the Punjab State on linguistic basis and so the old Punjab State was bifurcated into two States, called Punjab and Haryana. The Government also intended to transfer some

areas of Himachal Pradesh —a Union Territory—to the new Punjab State.

According to the Constitution (Nineteenth Amendment) Act, 1966, in Article 324 of the Constitution in clause (1) the words "including the appointment of election tribunals for the decision of doubts and disputes arising out of or in connection with election to Parliament and to the Legislatures of States" were omitted.

The Constitution (Twentieth Amendment) Act of 1966 inserted a new Article 233A after Article 233 to validate the appointments, postings, transfers, and judgments, decrees, sentences, and other orders whose appointments were declared void by the Supreme Court.

The Constitution (Twenty-first Amendment) Act of 1967 inserted " Sindhi " language in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution.

By the Constitution (Twenty-second Amendment) Act, 1969, Article 244A was added to the Constitution providing the formation of an autonomous State comprising certain tribal areas in Assam and creation of local Legislature or Council of Ministers or both. Article 371B was added empowering the President to provide for the constitution and functions of a committee of the Legislative Assembly of the State.

The Constitution (Twenty-third Amendment) Act of 1970 provided that Article 330 of the Constitution, in sub-clause (b) of clause (I), for the words " except the Scheduled Tribes, in the Tribal areas of Assam", the words "except the Scheduled Tribes in the tribal areas of Assam and in Nagaland" shall be substituted. In Article 333 of the Constitution, for the words " nominate such number of members of the community to the Assembly as he considers appropriate", the words "nominate one member of that community to the Assembly" shall be substituted. In Article 334 of the Constitution for the words "twenty years", the words "thirty years" shall be substituted.

According to the Constitution (Twenty-fourth Amendment) Act, 1971, (i) " Notwithstanding anything in the Constitution, Parliament may in exercise of its constituent power amend by way of addition, variation or repeal any provision of this Constitution", and, (ii) that the President shall " give his assent to a Constitution Amendment Bill if it has been passed by both the Houses" and (iii) that " nothing in Article 13 (which provides that the State shall not make any law which takes away or abridges fundamental rights) shall have application to laws passed under the 24th Amendment."

The Constitution (Twenty-fifth Amendment) Act of 1971 (it was passed by the two Houses of Parliament in 1971 but received the President's assent on 20th April, 1972) sought to remove the difficulties for giving effect to the Directive Principles of State Policy by the Supreme Court's interpretation in the Bank Nationalization Case of 1970 of the word "compensation" in clause 2 of Article 31. The Act substituted the clause, replacing the word "compensation" with the word "amount". The substituted clause ensured

that "property can be compulsorily acquired or requisitioned for a public purpose for an amount which may be fixed or determined in accordance with the law and this shall not be called in question in any court on the ground that the amount is not adequate or that the whole or any part of such amount is to be given otherwise than in cash." The Act also introduced a new Article 31C which ensured that "the law passed to give effect to the Directive Principles shall not be deemed to be void on the ground that it takes away or abridges any of the rights contained in Articles 14, 19 or 31."

The Constitution (Twenty-sixth Amendment) Act of 1971 inserted a new Article in the constitution expressly terminating the recognition already granted to Rulers of States, abolishing Privy Purses and extinguishing all rights, liabilities and obligations in respect of Privy Purses.

The Constitution (Twenty-seventh Amendment) Act of 1971 provided for inclusion of the Union Territory of Mizoram in Article 239A of the Constitution to give it a Legislature and a Council of Ministers. It also provided that the Administrator of a Union Territory with Legislature shall have the power to promulgate Ordinances when the Legislature is not in session.

By the Constitution (Twenty-eighth Amendment) Act a new Article 312A was inserted after Article 312 of the Constitution investing the Parliament to "vary or revoke conditions of service of officers of certain services". The Parliament may by law—

(a) vary or revoke, whether prospectively or retrospectively, the conditions of service as respects remuneration, leave and pension and the rights as respects disciplinary matters of persons who, having been appointed by the Secretary of State or Secretary of State in Council to a civil service of the crown in India before the commencement of this Constitution, continue on or after the commencement of the Constitution (Twenty-eighth Amendment) Act, 1972 to serve under the Government of India or of a State in any service or post;

(b) vary or revoke, whether prospectively or retrospectively the conditions of service as respects pension of persons who, having been appointed by the Secretary of State or Secretary of State in Council to a civil service of the Crown in India before the commencement of this Constitution, retired or otherwise ceased to be in service at any time before the commencement of the Constitution (Twenty-eighth Amendment) Act, 1972:

Provided that in the case of any such person who is holding or has held the office of the Chief Justice or any other judge of the Supreme Court or a High Court, the Comptroller or Auditor-General of India, the Chairman or other member of the Union or a State Public Service Commission or the the Chief Election Commissioner, nothing in sub-clause (a) or sub-clause (b) shall be construed as empowering Parliament to vary or revoke, after his retirement to such post, the conditions of his service to his disadvantage

except in so far as such conditions of service are applicable to him by reason of his being a person appointed by the Secretary of State or Secretary of State in Council to a civil service of the Crown in India.

By the Constitution (Twenty-ninth Amendment) Act the Kerala Land Reforms (Amendment) Acts of 1969 and 1971 are included in the Ninth schedule of the Constitution of India and thereby the Acts which had been struck down in parts by the Supreme Court and the Kerala High Court are validated.

According to the Constituion (Thirtieth Amendment) Act (passed by two Houses of the Parliament in 1972 but which received the President's assent on 22nd February, 1973), Article 133 of the Constitution was amended providing for an appeal to the Supreme Court from any judgment, decree or final order in a civil proceeding of a High Court if the High Court certifies that " the case involves a substantial question of law of general importance and needs to be decided by the Supreme Court".

On 15th May, 1973, Parliament passed the Constitution (Thirty-first Amendment) Bill increasing the maximum strength of the Lok Sabha from 525 to 545.

The Constitution (Thirty-third Amendment) Act of 1974 was passed by Parliament on 14 May, 1974, investing the Speakers and Chairmen of Legislatures with powers to reject such resignations of members they thought to have been extracted by coercive means.

The Parliament passed The Constitution (Thirty-fourth Amendment) Act on 28th August, 1974. By it land ceiling laws and land tenure reforms were protected against litigation in courts. This amendment added twenty laws prescribing lower land ceilings and removing intermediary tenures to the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution which protects laws against litigation on the ground that they violate Fundamental Rights.

The Constitution (Thirty-sixth Amendment) Act was passed by the Parliament in September, 1974, giving Sikkim, which had been hitherto an Indian " protectorate", the new status of an " Associate State". It provided representation of the people of Sikkim in the Indian Parliament. According to the Amendment, after Article 2 of the Constitution, the following Article shall be inserted, namely: "2A Sikkim, which comprises the territories specified in the Tenth Schedule, shall be associated with the Union on the terms and conditions set out in that Schedule. 'The Government of India' shall be solely responsible for the defence and territorial integrity of Sikkim and for the conduct and regulation of the external relations of Sikkim, whether political, economical or financial." As regards Sikkim's representation in Parliament it is provided that "there shall be allotted to Sikkim one seat in the Council of States and one seat in the House of the People". The "Representative of Sikkim in the Council of States shall be elected by the members of the Sikkim Assembly" and the "representative of Sikkim in the House of the

People shall be chosen by direct election, and for this purpose, the whole of Sikkim shall form one parliamentary constituency to be called the parliamentary constituency for Sikkim."

Of late some highly significant Amendments have been made in the Constituency of India. On 1st August, 1975, the President gave assent to the Thirty-eighth Amendment Act "making President's power to declare emergency and to promulgate ordinances non-justiciable". The Lok Sabha passed on 7th August, 1975, the Constitution (Thirty-ninth) Amendment Act to place beyond challenge in courts the election to parliament of a person holding the office of Prime Minister or Speaker and the election of President and Vice-President.

Further, the Lok Sabha passed on 25th May, 1976, the Constitution (Fortieth) Amendment Act "extending the scope of Article 257, relating to territorial waters to include the concept of exclusive economic zone and to enlarge the list of entries in the Ninth Schedule to give protection to certain State and Central Laws, mostly connected with land reforms."

On 25th June, 1975, the President of India declared a state of emergency in the country "due to the existence of a threat to the security of India from internal disturbance". On 29th June he issued an ordinance amending the Maintenance of Internal Security (Amendment) Act under which "no grounds need be given for detention".

On 1st July, 1975, the Prime Minister in a broadcast to the nation announced a package of economic measures—the 20-point Economic Programme. The twenty points are:

1. Continuance of steps to bring down prices of essential commodities. Stream-lined production, procurement and distribution of essential commodities. Strict economy in government expenditure.
2. Implementation of agricultural land ceilings and speedier distribution of surplus land and compilation of land records.
3. Stepping up of provision of house sites for landless and weaker sections.
4. Bonded labour, wherever it exists, will be declared illegal.
5. Plea for liquidation of rural indebtedness. Legislation for moratorium on recovery of debt from landless labourers, small farmers and artisans.
6. Review of laws on minimum agricultural wages.
7. Five million more hectares to be brought under irrigation. National programme for use of underground water.
8. An accelerated power programme. Superthermal stations under central control.
9. New development plan for development of handloom sector.
10. Improvement in quality and supply of peoples' cloth.
11. Socialization of urban and urbanisable land. Ceiling on ownership and possession of vacant land and on plinth area of new dwelling units.

12. Special squads for valuation of conspicuous construction and prevertion of tax evasion.
13. Special legislation for confiscation of smuggler's properties.
14. Liberalisation of investment procedures. Action against misuse of import licences.
15. New schemes for workers' association in industry.
16. National permit scheme for road transport.
17. Income Tax relief to middle class; exemption list to be placed at Rs. 8000.
18. Essential commodities at controlled prices to students in hostels.
19. Books and stationery at controlled prices.
20. New apprenticeship scheme to enlarge employment and training, especially of weaker sections.

The Constitution (Thirty-ninth Amendment) Act, 1975 laid down: "For Article 71 of the Constitution, the following article shall be substituted, namely: subject to the provisions of this Constitution, Parliament may by law regulate any matter relating to or connected with the election of a President, or Vice-President including the grounds on which such election may be questioned:

"Provided that the election of a person as President or Vice-President shall not be called in question on the ground of existence of any vacancy for whatevereason among the members of the electoral college electing him."

The Constitution (Forty-second Amendment), Bill which was finally passed by the Parliament on 11th November, 1976 received President's assent on 18th December, 1976, after which it was ratified by more than half the number of States. It has been regarded as a restraint on the country's Democracy in certain respects. It gave primacy to the Directive Principles enumerated in the Constitution over all Fundamental Rights and made all the Directives enforceable through the Courts. The Directives also became Rights under the amended Constitution. The measure reasserted once for all the supremacy of Parliament over other wings of Government and asserted its power to amend any provision in the Constitution. No change made by it in the Constitution could henceforth be challenged in any courts of law on any ground whatsoever. It incorporates for the first time in the Preamble the words "Sovereign, Socialist, Secular, Democratic Republic". An exhaustive chapter on the Citizens' Fundamental Duties was included for the first time in the Constitution. The role of the judiciary became subordinate and some of its powers removed and its jurisdiction curtailed. The federal character of the Indian Union remained unchanged. The new Constitutional changes were to be ratified by the States. The Central Government became stronger as a result of these changes. No change was made in the rights of the minority communities as these were guaranteed under the Constitution originally.

The Constitution (Forty-fourth Amendment) Act introduced by the Law Minister in the Lok Sabha seeks to delete the anti-democratic provisions enacted in the Constitution by a previous Amendment (Forty-second Amendment). The High Courts will get back their jurisdiction. With deletion of Articles 32A, 131A, 144A, 226A and 228A the High Courts will again supervise the law and the decisions of all courts functioning within the States. They will once again get the power to determine the constitutional validity of all laws, including laws made by Parliament. There will be no constraints, either in the Supreme Court or in the High Courts, regarding the number of judges "who should pronounce enacted laws as invalid".

At a meeting held at the Prime Minister's residence on 31st December, 1977, there was a consensus of opinion for addition of a separate provision to Article 368 of the Constitution to the effect that before any amendment to the Constitution relating to certain specific matters is given effect to, it will have endorsement through a referendum. A view is being taken in the Janata Government that some sections of the Amendment can be retained without violating the Janata Party's pledges to the people.

APPENDIX III

FOREIGN AGGRESSIONS
(to September, 1966)

1. The Chinese Invasion

THE relations between Free India and the Communist Government of China were at first quite friendly, but they were disturbed by the Chinese attitude towards Tibet, which was an autonomous State under the suzerainty of China. Free India had friendly relations with Tibet and "had inherited from the British certain old-established rights, including an agent in Lhasa, trade agencies in Gyantse and Yatung, post and telegraph offices on the trade route to Gyantse and a small military escort for their protection". But China invaded Tibet in 1950 and forced her ruler, the Dalai Lama, to accept a treaty (1951) by which the autonomy of Tibet was replaced by fullfledged sovereignty of China. This aroused India's apprehensions about the expansinoist policy of China as there were over 3,000 kilometres of common border between the two countries. On 20th April, 1954, there was an agreement between India and China by which both accepted *Pancha Sheel*—Five principles—as the basis of their relations as friendly neighbours. Under this agreement India abandoned all the privileges she had hitherto enjoyed in Tibet as mentioned above. In June, 1954, Chou En-lai, the Chinese Premier, visited India and friendship between India and China seemed to have been firmly established.

There was, however, a rift in the lute when the Chinese published maps including 132,090 sqare kilometres of Indian territory in the Himalaya region, from Ladakh to the Assam border, as parts of the Chinese dominions. At first they offered various excuses and explanations for this wrongful inclusion of Indian territory in their maps. But the crisis came in 1959 when the Chinese overran Tibet and introduced a veritable reign of terror, in consequence of which the Dalai Lama, the secular and spiritual head of Tibet, and a large number of Tibetans have sought refuge in India. About the same time the Chinese invaded Himalayan regions of India, and, in spite of strong protests and repeated attempts of the Government of India to reach an amicable settlement, the Chinese occupied about 31,000 square kilometres of Indian territory. This aggression of China meant a complete disregard on her part of the Five Principles (*Pancha Sheel*), to which she had pledged

herself in the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954, and of the Ten Principles drawn up at the Bandung Conference of Asian-African nations in 1955. But something worse was yet to come. On 20th October, 1962, about 30,000 Chinese troops began a large-scale invasion of Ladakh and NEFA (North-Eastern Frontier Agency), to the north of Assam. The Indian troops fought gallantly, but, being vastly outnumbered, could not offer any effective resistance in NEFA. On 19th November Bomdi La was captured and the whole of Assam lay at the mercy of the Chinese, who had also occupied the portion of Ladakh claimed by them. But on 21st November they declared a unilateral cease-fire and retired to a considerable distance.

This, however, indicated no intention on the part of China to disgorge the gains of aggression. In view of certain discrepancies and contradictions in the so-called cease-fire proposal of China, Prime Minister Nehru wrote to Premier Chou En-lai on 1st December, 1962, commending for his acceptance "the clear and straightforward proposal, namely, at least the restoration of the *status quo* prior to 8th September, 1962, so that the necessary atmosphere for reverting to peaceful processes may be created".

Anxious to promote world peace and amity, Nehru addressed a communication about Chinese aggression to the Governments of most of the countries of the world and received in return messages of sympathy and support from sixty-three countries. To evolve a peaceful settlement of the conflict six non-aligned countries, namely, Ceylon, Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Ghana and the United Arab Republic, met in a conference at Colombo from 10th to the 12th December, 1962, and made some proposals suggesting a *via media*. After clarification of the proposals by representatives of three countries of the Colombo Conference, the Indian Government accepted these, but China did not, and, in open violation of these proposals, the Chinese established seven civil posts in the western sector and placed stone cairns along the so-called "line of control". All gestures for peace on the part of India were negatived by the uncompromising attitude on the part of the Chinese Government and they have continued to increase their military strength along the Indian border. The Chinese are now in possession of 36,260 square kilometres of Indian territory in Ladakh and 5,180 square kilometres in the North-Eastern Frontier.

Chinese diplomacy has not been marked by a feeling of friendliness towards India. Rather China supplied arms to Pakistān and trained Pakistāni military personnel. She also tried to meddle in the affairs of Nepal and to turn her against India. India, on the contrary, followed peaceful diplomacy. Even after 1962, India supported China's case for membership in the U.N. The Government of India expressed their desire to settle border problems by peaceful means. The Foreign Minister of India stated in the Rajya Sabha on 26th August, 1970: "We do notice a slight change in the attitude of China towards, and propaganda against, her neighbours including India of late, but we have not yet seen any change in the substantive matters

so far as the Chinese stand towards India is concerned.... We are always prepared to settle all matters, with our neighbours, including China, peacefully through bilateral negotiations on the basis of respect for our territorial integrity and sovereignty, and the non-use of force or threat of force. In the interests of peace there is need to develop friendly relations between the two countries. In July, 1976 India has sent her ambassador to China and China has also sent her ambassador to India.

2. Invasion by Pakistān

The dispute with Pakistān entered a new phase when it was discovered on 5th August, 1965, that quite a large number of Pakistānis in disguise had infiltrated into Kāshmīr. They included regular army personnel and their object was to incite the people of Kāshmīr into rebellion against the Government. The object entirely failed, as they received no help or encuragement from the people of Kāshmīr. The Indian security forces immediately started mopping up operations, and it was soon found that the number of infiltrators was not less than 3,000 and probably more. They had begun entering into Kāshmīr territory long before August and had established secret depots of arms. On 27th August regular Pakistāni troops crossed the Cease-Fire Line (CFL) but retired after a heavy clash with Indian forces. On the first day of September, 1965, Pakistān launched a major offensive with two regiments of Patton tanks and Sabre jet-fighters (lent them by the U.S.A. long before for the specific purpose of use in war with China) in the Chhamb sector and entered a few miles within the territory of Jammu after crossing the international border between India and Pakistān. India replied to this undeclared warfare on the part of Pakistān by immediately invading Pakistān at several points. The Indian Army destroyed a large number of Patton tanks and not only halted the advance of the Pakistān Army but also advanced within a few miles of Lahore and Sialkot after inflicting severe losses upon the retreating Pakistān forces. There were heavy bombing raids by both sides, but while the Indian Air Force hit only important military bases and installations, the Pakistāni Air Force bombarded civil areas and destroyed many civil buildings including a church and a hospital. The question was taken up by the Security Council of U.N.O., which passed a resolution asking both India and Pakistān to cease all hostile operations. In obedience to this resolution there was a cease-fire on both sides on 23rd September and the armies of both India and Pakistān occupied the line which they held on that date. But in spite of a number of observers (military personnel of neutral countries) sent by the Security Council, Pakistān did not cease to make minor violations of the cease-fire agreement against which India lodged strong protest. In order to restore cordial relations between the two countries the Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R., Mr. Kosygin, arranged

a meeting between the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistān, which took place at Tashkent in Russian Turkestan, early in January, 1966. A mutual agreement of peace and friendship between India and Pakistān was signed and it was followed, almost immediately, by the sudden and tragic death of the Indian Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri, at 1 a.m. on 11th January, 1966. The loss is so tragic the fact that the subsequent activities of Pakistan do not seem to have been influenced in any way by the Tashkent Agreement or its spirit.

While India was fighting against Pakistān, China, which had been an ally of Pakistān for some time past, concentrated forces on the Himalayan border, and threatened to invade India on the most flimsy grounds. On 17th September, 1965 the Chinese Government sent an ultimatum that if India did not dismantle military installations set up by her beyond the Sikkim-China border within three days she would invade India. India denied having ever set up any such installations, and on the 19th the date of the expiry of the ultimatum was extended by three days. The Chinese evidently planned to invade India while she was engaged with Pakistān, and presumably on account of the cease-fire agreement between India and Pakistān did not proceed to carry out the threatened invasion. The Chinese were busy for some time making heavy concentrations of troops on the Himalayan border and creating a tense situation.

Chinese diplomacy was not marked by feelings of friendliness towards India. Rather they supplied arms to Pakistān and trained Pakistāni military personnel. She also tried to meddle in the affairs of Nepal and to mislead Nepal against India. India on the contrary followed peaceful diplomacy. Even after 1962, India supported China's case for membership in the U.N. The Government of India expressed their desire to settle border problems by peaceful means. The Foreign Minister of India stated in the Rajya Sabha on 26th August, 1970: "We are always prepared to settle all matters with our neighbours, including China, peacefully through bilateral negotiation on the basis of respect for our territorial integrity and sovereignty, and the non-use of force or threat of force." For the interest of peace there is need for developing friendly relations between the two countries. In 1976 the Government of India decided to send an ambassador to China.

APPENDIX IV

THE EMERGENCE OF BANGLADESH

INDIA's Prime Minister Mrs Indira Gandhi said in a radio talk on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Tashkent Agreement: " I should like to reaffirm India's commitment to peace and peaceful methods of settling international differences. Despite the irreversible events of history, the future of the peoples of India and Pakistān demands co-operation. We share so many affinities. Our task is to build a better life for our peoples. Discord will weaken us both and retard our progress. We can prosper only if we live in amity."

But there was no sincere reciprocation to these sentiments from Pakistān. It continued to propagate feelings of hatred against India. Pakistān participated in the military alliances of the West, allowed her territory to become a sphere for international intrigue, and obtained arms aid from foreign powers. In the international field her policy was that those who opposed India "were her friends", and she carried on "hate India" and "crush India" campaigns. The logic of these attitudes eventually drove the two countries into armed conflict again in December 1971.

In the meantime, dramatic developments had taken place in the area described as East Pakistān after the partition of India in 1947. The people there were seething with discontent due to West Pakistān's undue domination over them in all respects—administrative, economic and cultural. The key administrative positions were held by West Pakistānis; in economic and industrial matters the people of East Pakistan were exploited and discriminated against;[1] and attempts were made by the West Pakistān ruling authroities to impose on the people of the eastern part a culture alien to them, and to make Urdu the sole official language ignoring the claims of the people whose mother tongue and vehicle of culture had been Bengali all along. One writer has aptly observed that "in all the aspects of life, the people of West Pakistān have acted towards the people of East Pakistān as if East Pakistān was a colonial possession of West Pakistān[2] ".

Pakistān's soldier-President, Field-Marshal Mohammed Ayub Khan, stepped down and handed over power to the Army Commander-in-Chief,

[1]Subash C. Kashyap, (ed.),: *Bangladesh (Background and Perspectives)* (New Delhi, 1971), Appendix.

[2]'Limits of Political Obligation' by Rasheeduddin Khan in ibid.

General Yahya Khan, on 25th March, 1969. In his first radio talk on 26th March, Yahya Khan promised "the establishment of a constitutional government". The first election in twenty-two years was held in Pakistān on 7th December, 1970 on the basis of adult franchise. The Awami League Party of East Pakistān, under the leadership of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman, was returned with a clear majority winning 160 out of the 162 seats for East Pakistān in the National Assembly, and 288 out of the 300 seats in the East Pakistān Assembly. With the election of 10 women members to it, the Awami League Party came to have 298 seats out of 310 seats.

But the hopes of the people for a representative government were belied as Yahya Khan evaded it on one plea or the other. Led by Sheikh Mujibur Rehman, the people of East Bengal launched a civl disobedience movement on 8th March, 1971, to press for their constitutional rights. The students played a prominent role in this movement. On 9th March, the East Bengal judges refused to swear in Lt.General Tikka Khan as Governor of that area. For some days Yahya Khan had a series of fruitless talks with Mujibur Rehman. These, writes Anthony Mascarenhas, "were never meant to succeed. The talks were just a stratagem to give Tikka Khan and the army that additional margin of time they needed to bring in reinforcements from the western wing."[1]

On 25th March, in a ruthless attempt to suppress the East Bengal people's movement for liberation, Yahya launched a military campaign of the most virulent type. A reign of terror was unleashed. Men, women and children were indiscriminately slaughtered while the women were also dishonoured. In what became a cold-blooded campaign of genocide the intellectuals—academics and professionals —and the flower of youth, the students, were massacred. To escape death and dishonour, a large number of people from East Bengal came to India as refugees and the Government of India took all possible steps to afford them food and shelter. Philanthropic institutions like the Ramakrishna Mission and the Bharat Seva Sangh organized relief works for the refugees. India also did much to evoke international support and sympathy for their plight.

The people of East Bengal remained undaunted. Using whatever tactics they could, including guerilla warfare, they opposed military oppression with remarkable enthusiasm and bravery in their fight for freedom and democracy.

On 28th March, 1971, the liberation army chief, Major Ziauddin Khan,

[1] Anthony Mascarenhas, *The Bangladesh* (Delhi, 1971), p. 108.

Anthony Mascarenhas is a journalist and was an eye-witness to the massacre of the people of East Bengal by the Pakistāni militarists. He was one of the eight West Pakistāni journalists who were taken on a conducted tour of East Bengal by the military administration so that they might report to the people of West Pakistān about " the great job the army was doing". But he refused to sell his conscience. He said, " either I would write the full story of what I had seen or I would have to stop writing."

announced the formation of a Bangladesh government. Mujibur Rehman was named the President and Syed Nazrul Islam the Vice-President. As acting President, Syed Nazrul Islam formed a six-member cabinet with the Awami League leader, Tajuddin Ahmed, as the Prime Minister. On 17th April, 1971, Tajuddin Ahmed issued an appeal to the people of the world in which he stated: " Bangladesh is at war. It has been given no choice but to secure its right of self-determination through a national liberation struggle against the colonial oppression of Pakistān. . . . Pakistān is now dead and buried under the mountain of corpses. The hundreds and thousands of people murdered by the army in Bangladesh will be an impenetrable barrier between West Pakistān and the people of Bangladesh. . . . We now appeal to the nations of the world for recognition and assistance both material and mineral in our struggle for nationhood. Every day this is delayed a thousand lives are lost and more of Bangladesh's vital assets are destroyed. In the name of Humanity act now and earn our undying friendship."

The blood-bath perpetrated in East Bengal by the West Pakistāni armies shocked the world. For India it was a matter of vital concern. She could not have remained a silent spectator to the massacre of an innocent people whose only fault was that they were claiming "basic human rights". On 31st March, 1971, the Indian Parliament unanimously passed a resolution " expressing its profound sympathy for and solidarity with the people of East Bengal in their struggle for democratic ways of life". It pressed for "immediate cessation of the use of force and the massacre of defenceless people" and called upon all peoples and governments "to take urgent and constructive steps to prevail upon the Government of Pakistān to put an end to the systematic decimation of people which amounted to genocide".

While the brave fighters of the Mukti Bahini in East Bengal were winning victories against the Pakistāni troops, Pakistān's military junta dragged India into a conflict with her by bombing her border territories without any provocation. The Prime Minister, who was in Calcutta at the time, informed the country of Pakistān's aggression while addressing a mammoth public meeting there on 3rd December, 1971. The President of India announced a few hours after this: "A grave emergency exists whereby the security of India is threatened by external aggression." On 4th December, Pakistān officially declared war on India.

The results of this war were disastrous for Pakistān thanks to the bold and decisive strategies of India's land, air and naval forces. On 6th December, India officially recognized Bangladesh as an independent democratic State and Bhutan followed suit on the 7th. On 16th December, India and Bangladesh entered into an agreement to fight Pakistān under a joint military command. Lt. General Jagjit Singh Aurora became its Chief Commander. Fighting with irresistible determination, the combined forces inflicted crushing defeats on Pakistāni troops at various centres. After the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Army, General Manekshaw, had sent notes of warning

and appeal to Major General Firman Ali, Commander of the Dacca garrison, Lt. General Niazi, Commander of the Pakistāni forces in Bangladesh, and the Pakistāni troops surrendered unconditionally to General Aurora at 4.21 p.m. on 16th December at the Dacca Race Course ground. Dacca became the capital of independent Bangladesh. After this complete defeat of the Pakistāni forces, Yahya Khan's position became untenable and he transferred power to Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto as President and Chief Martial Law Administrator of Pakistān. Sheikh Mujibur Rehman was released from jail on 22nd December and came to India via London on 10th January, 1972. He was received with the loud acclamations and cheers of a vast crowd at Palam Airport and the greetings of the President and Prime Minister of India.

On 19th March, 1972, the Prime Ministers of India and Bangladesh signed a twenty-five year "Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Peace" in Dacca. As regards the proposed trial of 195 Pakistāni prisoners on charges of war crimes, they said in a joint declaration: "Both Prime Ministers hope that these trials will bring the guilty persons to justice and also bring home to the world at large the enormity of the suffering of the people of Bangladesh." They also referred, in the joint declaration, to the need "to keep the Indian Ocean area free of great power rivalries and military competitions", declared the two countries' "opposition to the establishment of land, air and naval bases, in the area" and demanded that the area be made a nuclear free zone. A cultural co-operation agreement between Bangladesh and India was signed at Dacca on 30th December, 1972, "for promoting and developing the relations and understanding between the two countries in the field of culture, education and academic activities in science and technology".

Z. A. Bhutto declared his desire to live in peace with India. This has always been India's aim. So her Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi took the initiative in this matter. Pre-summit talks were arranged at Murree near Rawalpindi in the last week of April, 1972, between the Indian delegation led by Mr. D. P. Dhar, Chairman of the Policy Planning Committee in India's Ministry of External Affairs, and the Pakistān team headed by Mr. Aziz Ahmed, Secretary-General of Pakistān's Foreign Affairs Ministry. This was followed by the summit meeting at Simla from 28th June, 1972, as a result of which Mrs. Gandhi and President Bhutto signed an agreement on the night of 2-3 July. According to the terms of this agreement, the two countries decided "to put an end to the conflict and confrontation that have hitherto marred their relations and work for the promotion of a friendly and harmonious relationship and the establishment of a durable peace in the subcontinent, so that both countries may henceforth devote their resources and energies to the pressing task of advancing the welfare of their people." Both the parties reiterated their faith in the U.N. Charter. They further agreed to resume normal contacts in communications, travel facilities, trade, etc., to disengage their troops and return occupied territory beyond the recognized international borders, and to maintain the *status quo* in Kashmir and Jammu as on 17th

December, 1971. Both the countries undertook not to take any step to change the actual line of control unilaterally. It was further agreed that differences between India and Pakistān were henceforth to be solved through bilateral negotiations or any other peaceful means agreed upon by both.

The Simla Pact was on the whole well received in India and other countries as "a first step" towards the establishment of friendly relations between Pakistān and India. But some critics in India described it as "a sell-out" and a blunder. President Bhutto said at Rawalpindi that "nobody has won and nobody has lost" by the Agreement and that it was a victory for the "principles of justice and fairplay".

The agreement reached at Lahore on 7th December, 1972, between General Manekshaw and General Tikka Khan—the Army Chiefs of India and Pakistān—was significant because the Indian view that Thako Chak in Kāshmīr belonged to India was conceded. Their joint statement mentioned that "the line of control (in Jammu and Kāshmīr) will commence from the Chhamb sector and end in the Turlok sector in Partapur". General Manekshaw made some "minor adjustments in the interest of peace and in order to rationalize the line of control".

However, since the Simla Agreement was concluded, there have been repeated "evasions and ambiguities" in the Pakistān President's statements regarding the implementation of the terms of the Agreement. Nor has Pakistān taken any concrete steps till now to recognize Bangladesh as a sovereign country which is considered to be an important prerequisite for establishing normalcy in the sub-continent. On 30th November, 1972, the 27th General Assembly Session of the U.N. unanimously approved a 23-nation resolution recommending that the Republic of Bangladesh be admitted to the organization. Though Pakistān did not recognize Bangladesh, it did not get any note of dissent recorded either and this was construed as a *de facto* recognition of the Dacca regime by Pakistān. However, Bangladesh's admission was vetoed by China in the Security Council and its application is still pending.

According to the new constitution adopted by it on 16th December, 1972, Bangladesh had its first general election on 7th March, 1973. Before this date, eleven candidates of the ruling Awami League led by Sheikh Mujibur Rehman had been elected unopposed. The result of the election was overwhelming victory for the Awami League. In the final party positions as they emerged on 11th March the ruling Awami League had 292 seats, the Independents 5, Bangladesh Jatiyo League 1, and the National Socialist Party (Muzaffar Group) 1.

The situation in the sub-continent still remained deadlocked and so, early in April, 1973, India once again took the initiative to find a solution. P. N. Haksar, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's special emissary, went to Dacca and met Sheikh Mujibur Rehman and Dr. Kamal Hossain, the Foreign Minister, to discuss a basis for negotiations with Pakistān. On 12th April,

Dr. Kamal Hossain came to Delhi to finalize details and, on the 17th, India and Bangladesh released a joint declaration. The declaration called upon Pakistān to agree to the " simultaneous repatriation " of civilian internees and prisoners of war—except those required by Bangladesh for trial on " criminal charges "—as also of Bengalis in Pakistān and non-Bengalis in Bangladesh who had declared allegiance to Pakistān. The declaration expressed "regret and concern" at Pakistān's failure to recognize Bangladesh but reaffirmed that the Governments of India and Bangladesh were ready to find a solution "to all humanitarian problems" without prejudicing their respective positions and hoped that Pakistān would reciprocate accordingly.

Even though the joint Indo-Bangladesh Declaration was hailed throughout the world as a " significant attempt to find a way out of the impasse on the sub-continent ", it did not lead to any immediate improvement in the situation. In its reply, dated 20th April, to the Declaration, Pakistān spoke of " the difficulties inherent in the terms of the Delhi declaration " and stated that it could not recognize " the competence of the authorities in Dacca " to bring to trial any among the prisoners of war on criminal charges. It also expressed the need for consultations with India to clarify some of the implications of the Declaration. However, even while India and Bangladesh were studying its reply, the Pakistān Government rounded up large numbers of Bengali civil servants and military personnel in its service on 6th May and placed them in detention camps. On 11th May, Pakistān began proceedings against India at the International Court of Justice at the Hague in an attempt to prevent India from transferring to Bangladesh the 195 prisoners of war who face trial there. It also requested the Court to issue an interim injunction ordering India not to hand over the prisonres till the case had been finally judged. Furthermore, on 19th May, the Government of Pakistān revived its dispute with India on the question of overflights at the International Civil Aviation Organization.

India's External Affairs Minister, Swaran Singh, said at Prague on 1st June that " India regards the action of Pakistān as in clear contravention of the Simla Agreement, by which both countries agreed to solve all problems by mutual discussion and not to involve any outside authorities ". He also stated that India did not recognize the competence of the International Court of Justice on the question of the prisoners of war and, consequently, India boycotted the hearings of the Court which began on 4th June.

However, India continued to seek a meeting with Pakistān to solve outstanding problems within the framework of the Indo-Bangladesh Declaration. Indian efforts paid off on 25th June when the President of Pakistān sent a letter agreeing to discuss the package deal embodied in the April Declaration. Pakistān also withdrew its petitions to the World Court and the ICAO and the way was now clear for a meeting between the two sides.

The Prime Minister's special emissary, Mr. P. N. Haksar, flew to Dacca to consult the Government of Bangladesh and finalize a brief for the coming

talks. On 23rd July, the Indian team, led by Mr. Haksar, arrived in Islamabad and began its meetings with the Pakistāni team—led by Mr. Aziz Ahmed, Minister of State for Defence and Foreign Affairs—the next day. After eight days of discussions, the two teams decided to adjourn the talks to "enable all parties to take stock of the situation". Mr. P. N. Haksar again flew to Dacca to hold further discussions with Bangladesh and it was agreed that India would confine its discussions with Pakistān to the three-way repatriation and would raise "no extraneous issue".

On 18th August the two teams reassembled in New Delhi but appeared to make little headway till, in order to avert a deadlock, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi intervened personally in the negotiations. After that, the talks progressed rapidly and, on 28th August, 1973, a comprehensive settlement was reached and an Agreement released simultaneously from Dacca, Delhi and Islamabad.

The Agreement was aimed at "liquidating the great bulk of the humanitarian problem left over by the 1971 conflict" and was made "without prejudice to the respective positions of the parties concerned relating to the case of 195 prisoners of war". It provided for a simultaneous "repatriation of all Pakistāni prisoners of war and civilian interneess...all Bengalis in Pakistān and all Pakistānis in Bangladesh". The Government of Pakistān agreed "to receive a substantial number of non-Bengalis...stated to have opted for repatriation to Pakistān...from Bangladesh" while Bangladesh was not to hold "trials of the 195 prisoners of war...during the entire period of repatriation".

The repatriations were scheduled to be completed by the end of September, 1973. After that, the Agreement says, "Bangladesh, India and Pakistān will discuss and settle the question of the 195 prisoners of war". If this issue is settled satisfactorily then there would appear to be no real obstacle to Pakistān recognizing Bangladesh as a sovereign, independent State. Perhaps it is not without significance that the August Agreement ended with the following sentence: "The special representative of the Prime Minister of India, having consulted the Government of Bangladesh, has also conveyed the concurrence of the Bangladesh Government in this Agreement."

A beginning was made for the implementation of the Delhi Agreement on 19th September, 1973, when the first batch of stranded Pakistānis in Bangladesh and that of Bengalis in Pakistān were repatriated to their respective countries. The process of normalization of relations among India, Pakistān and Bangladesh, as envisaged in the Simla Agreement, and building up of a durable peace in the sub-continent, has continued through several reconciliation talks and agreements. A "big forward step" was taken when Delhi, Pindi and Dacca signed "a historic agreement" on 9th April, 1974, which provided for more repatriations of the nationals of Bangladesh and Pakistān. India and Pakistān also decided on the same date "to take immediate steps for restoration of Postal and Telecommunication links and

travel facilities as visualized in the Simla Agreement." It is also significant that an Indo-Pakistān Trade Agreement was concluded on 7th December, 1974, removing about ten years' embargo on trade between India and Pakistān. In the same month India and Bangladesh issued a joint communique urging Pakistān to take all necessary steps, according to the Simla and Delhi accords, " to help normalize relations among the three countries and to ensure lasting peace in the sub-continent".

According to a Protocol signed in New Delhi on 15th January, 1975, India and Pakistān will resume direct shipping services, suspended since the 1965 conflict, " on the principles of sovereign equality and mutual benefit". India and Pakistān signed a Trade Agreement at Islamabad on 25th January, 1975, for one year, which may be extended further. In 1976 India and Pakistān have shown more conciliatory attitude towards each other. Agreements have been reached for running of air and rail services between the two countries.

After the Islamic Summit at Lahore, Pakistān recognized Bangladesh on 21st February, 1974. The Indo-Bangladesh accord has been reaffirmed. For three days, from 8th to 10th October, 1974, India's Foreign Affairs Minister, Y.B. Chavan, had talks in Dacca with Bangladesh leaders, especially with the Bangladesh Foreign Minister, Dr. Kamal Hossain. A Joint Communique at the conclusion of the talks stated that: " India and Bangladesh would work for the continued expansion in scope and extent of the relations between the two countries and to increase their efforts at expanding bilateral economic relations for mutual benefit." The two Foreign Ministers expressed the hope that according to the terms of the Simla and Delhi Agreements, Pakistān would make proper arrangements with Bangladesh on the matters like division of assets and repatriation of Pakistān refugees. These two leaders reiterated the views of their countries that the Indian Ocean should be a zone of peace and "expressed particular concern over the proposed expansion of naval facilities on the Diego Garcia." They reaffirmed their firm faith in the principles of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. New Trade Agreements were also signed between India and Bangladesh. But Bangladesh has had to face internal troubles for suppression of which the President of Bangladesh proclaimed, on 28th December, 1974, a state of emergency throughout Bangladesh in exercise of the power conferred by clause I of Article 141A of the Constitution of the People's Rupublic of Bangladesh. A Press Note issued at Dacca on that day said: "Emergency has been proclaimed in the whole of Bangladesh as security and economic life have been threatened by internal disturbances, and during the period the proclamation of emergency is in operation certain articles of the Constitution shall remain suspended as provided in the Constitution."

On 25th January, 1975, Sheikh Mujibur Rehman became the new President of Bangladesh after a change in its Constitution. The President will henceforth be the chief and final authority in matters of administration. The

Chief Minister and his Council will function as an advisory body to help and advise the President in all matters.

By an unfortunate turn of events in Bangladesh, Sheikh Mujibur Rehman was assassinated in 1975. Mr. Justice Mohammed resigned the Presidentship of Bangladesh on 21st April, 1976 on ground of ill health and nominated Major-General Zia-ur Rahman, Chief of Army Staff and Chief Martial Law Administrator, to succeed him as President. In a broadcast on 30th April, 1976 he summed up his policies in the following nineteen points: (i) To preserve the country's Independence, integrity and sovereignty at all costs; (ii) to reflect the four fundamental principles of the constitution in all spheres of national life; (iii) to make the nation self-reliant in every possible way; (iv) to ensure the participation of the people at every level of the administration, in development programmes and in the maintenance of order; (v) to strengthen the economy by according top priority to agricultural development; (vi) to ensure that no one went hungry by making the country self-sufficient in food; (vii) to ensure clothing for everyone, by increasing cloth production; (viii) to take all possible measures to ensure that no one remained homeless; (ix) to rid the country of illiteracy; (x) to ensure a minimum level of medical care for everyone; (xi) to give women their rightful place in society and to organize and inspire the young for building the nation; (xii) to give necessary incentives to the private sector for the economic development of the country; (xiii) to imporve the workers' conditions and to develop healthy labour-management relations in the interest of increased production; (xiv) to encourage the spirit of public service and nation-building among government employees and to improve their financial situation; (xv) to check the population explosion; (xvi) to establish friendship with all countries on a basis of equality and especially to strengthen relation with Muslim countries; (xvii) to decentralize the system of administration and develop and strengthen local government; (xviii) to establish a social order based on justice and free from corruption; (xix) to safeguard the rights of all citizens irrespective of religion, colour and sect and to consolidate national unity and solidarity.

Bangladesh and India maintained goodwill and cordiality. Farakka agreement with India on 5th November, 1976 and the border issue were amicably settled. There were Indo-Bangladesh high-level talks at New Delhi which were concluded on 7th April, 1976. Both sides reaffirmed their desire to work for better understanding and for promoting friendly relations. During the recent (December, 1977) Bangladesh delegation to India, under the leadership of its President General Zia-ur Rahman, India impressed upon the Delegation that after the solution of the Farakka and border issues all that India " wanted in return was friendship based on trust and confidence for the creation of which equal treatment of all citizens, irrespective of religion, was imperative ", and that all fear should be removed from the minds of the minority community.

APPENDIX V

RECENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHANGES

THE achievement of objects set forth in our Constitution presented stupendous problems. Our democracy was confronted with complex legacies of the long period of alien domination, appalling poverty and unemployment, prevalence of social injustice and inequality, extremely low percentage of education, unproductive economic condition, lack of adequate facilities for industrial and agricultural development and extremely low percentage of literacy among the common men and ignorance of the electorate.

Various measures have been recently introduced by the Union and State Governments to improve the living conditions of the masses and to effect an all-round economic development. In March, 1950, the Government of India set up the Planning Commission to prepare a plan for the "most effective and balanced utilization of the country's resources". The main objective of planning was defined as starting "a process of development which will raise living standards and open out to the people new opportunities for a richer and more varied life". Economic planning was to be considered as "an integral part of the wider process aiming not merely at the development of human faculties and the building up of an institutional framework adequate to the needs and aspirations of the people". Through working of the three Plans there has been noticeable developments in organized industries and minerals, in villages and small industries, in major and medium irrigation, in transport and communications and in social services. Though in certain respects progress was slow due to some unavoidable factors, particularly unfavourable weather conditions, we hope that the deficiencies would be removed to a large extent by faithful implementation of the Fourth Five-Year Plan which aims at "generating a rapid increase in the national product, without imparing social stability". Details of the Fifth Five-Year Plan are under consideration now.

Landlordism or the Zamindari system, which sapped the initiative and enterprise of the Indian peasants, has been liquidated as a result of some Acts passed in different States. Of the territorial magnates, dispossessed of their zamindaris, many have invested capital in industrial and commercial concerns. Some of them of lower rank have been reduced to the status of middle class. We may note in this connection the *Bhoodan* (land

gift) movement of one of our saint-patriot Acharya Vinobaji. In 1951 he was offered the first land gift in a small village in the Nalgonda district of the Telangana area of the Hyderabad State. It has developed into an All-India Movement in the course of these years. Legislation has been passed in almost all the States to provide for a ceiling on land holdings. But implementation of the laws passed in this respect has been slow, and provisions regarding level of ceilings, transfers and exemption from ceilings vary from State to State.

To help rural development on an extensive scale the Banks have been nationalized. July 19th 1969 is a highly significant landmark in the history of Indian banking. By an Ordinance the President of India nationalized fourteen major Indian private commercial banks. The Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Bill was introduced on 25th July and passed by both Houses of the Parliament on 8th August. The Bill became law on 9th August, when the President gave his assent to it. In a statement on 21st July in Parliament, India's Prime Minister thus explained the significance of the momentous decision of bank nationalisation: "The banks will now be better placed to serve the farmer and to promote agricultural production and rural development generally. Public ownership will also help curb the use of bank credit for speculative and other unproductive purpose. By severing the link between the major banks and the bigger industrial groups which have so far controlled them, Government believe that the step they have taken will also bring about the right atmosphere for the development of adequate professional management in the banking." By an Act of the Parliament the Government took over the management of General Insurance Companies in 1971. In May, 1972, the government took over the ownership of 214 coking coal mines and by the Coal Mines (Taking over of Management) Ordinance, promulgated on the 30th January, 1973, the Government "has taken over the entire management of the 464 private non-coking coal mines, pending nationalization of all the private non-coking coal mines with a view to ensuring a rational and co-ordinated development of coal production and promoting optimum utilization of coal resources consistent with the growing requirements of the economy."

After Independence, Government announced its industrial policy on 6th April, 1948. According to it Industries were divided roughly into four categories: (1) exclusive Government monopoly, (2) Government-controlled sphere, (3) Industries controlled and regulated by Government, (4) Private sphere under general governmental control. Co-ordination between large-scale and small-scale industries was emphasized. Ordinarily as regards capital the major interest in ownership and control was to be in the hands of the Indians.

For certain reasons it became necessary for the Government to assume greater and direct responsibility for industrial undertakings. So the Prime

Minister restated Government's Industrial Policy in the Parliament on 30th April, 1958 on the following points: new classification of industries, aid to cottage and small-scale industries, balance in industrial development in the different regions, application of co-operative principle in the industrial activities of the private sector and gradual association of workers and technicians with management of industries. Since the Second Five-Year Plan there has been progress in the growth and diversification of Indian industries.

During the recent years there has been an increase in agricultural production due to the use of modern machinery and equipment in cultivation, scientific manuring, extension of irrigation and improved credit facilities. This is expected to produce what is described as the Green Revolution. It has also been thought advisable to introduce co-operative farming.

For training in modern methods of agricultural work the following Agricultural Universities have been established in the country:

Andhra Pradesh Agricultural University
Assam Agricultural University
Haryana Agricultural University
Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur
Mahatma Fule Krishi Vidyapith
Orissa University of Agriculture and Technology
Punjab Agricultural University
Punjabrao Krishi Vidyapith, Maharashtra
Rajendra Agricultural University, Bihar
Uttar Pradesh Agricultural University, Pant Nagar
University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore

To promote such activities among the student and non-student youth the Ministry of Education was redesignated on 14th February, 1969 as the Ministry of Education and Youth Welfare. The Kothari Commission recommended that: "Some form of Social and national service should be made an integral part of education at all stages." Inaugurating a seminar at New Delhi on 9th March, 1969, the then Union Education Minister, Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao, announced that the Union Government proposes to draw up an "action-oriented national programme of youth services". There are the Birla Institute of Technology and Science, Pilani, Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, Jamia Milia Islamia, New Delhi, Gurukul Kangri Viswavidyalaya, Hardwar, Kashi Vidyapith, Varanasi, Gujarat Vidyapith, Ahmedabad, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Bombay and the Indian School of Mines, Dhanbad.

The Workmen's Compensation Act was amended in 1959 removing the distinction between an adult and a minor for the purpose of payment of

compensation. The Maternity Benefit Act of 1961 provided for uniform maternity protection. The Employees State Insurance Act, passed in 1948, was amended in 1951. This provides for maternity, disablement, sickness and medical facilities for all workers in factories using power and having twenty persons or more. Provision has also been made for Employees Provident Fund by an Act of 1952 which was subsequently amended in certain respects in 1960, 1962 and 1968.

Attempts have been made during the recent years to ease the situation. According to the Trade Unions Amendment Act of 1948 the employers have to recognize trade unions under the orders of a Labour Court. In December, 1966, the National Labour Commission was appointed under the chairmanship of Mr. P. B. Gajendragadkar. In its Report, which came out in August, 1969, certain salutary recommendations were made to improve the relations between the employers and the employees.

As planning in India aims at the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society importance of co-operation is being emphasized in the Five-Year Plans both for rural development and growth of cottage and small-scale industries and various schemes have been formulated for this.

Since the beginning of planned economic development in our country in 1950–1951 there have been important changes in the " volume and composition " of our foreign trade. There has been also increase in the magnitude of trade. The value of exports during a period of fifteen years rose by 33 per cent and that of imports was more than doubled.

The Janata Government has formulated various plans for widespread development, particularly in the rural areas. On 16th January, 1978, currency notes of the denomination of Rs. 1000, Rs. 5000 and Rs. 10,000 were demonetized by an Ordinance issued by the President.

APPENDIX VI

FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH OTHER POWERS

WITHOUT identifying herself with any of the blocks in the United Nations, India has played an important role in it. Awakening of the Afro-Asian Nations is a significant feature in the history of the modern world and India has welcomed it in the right spirit. The Asians Relations Conference which met in New Delhi in March–April, 1947 and the Conference of the Colombo Powers (Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia and Pakistān), which was held in April–May 1954, were concrete milestones in the growth of the idea of co-operation and harmony among the Afro-Asian countries. But a highly important landmark in this respect was the Conference held at Bandung in Indonesia (18th to 24th April, 1955). India was one of the sponsoring powers for the Bandung Conference and the most significant decision of this Conference was its Declaration on World Peace and Co-operation.

During the recent years, in spite of the menace of a " Cold War ", formation of military alliances and supply of military aid and some grave complications in international politics, India has steadfastly adhered to the policy of non-alignment and to the five principles of *Pancha Sheel*, namely, mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful co-existence. The Tashkent Declaration of 10th January, 1966, marked the culmination in the mission of peace of India's Prime Minister Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri. The Commemorative Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations was held from 14th to 24th October, 1970. The Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, called upon the United Nations " to strive to bring about an era of international transformation by consent, a new era of justice and peace."

Now there have been more of friendly agreements of India with foreign powers. On 26th October, 1977, Prime Minister Mr. Morarji Desai and the Soviet President Mr. Leonid Brezhnev signed in the Kremlin a joint declaration affirming the desire of the two countries to strengthen co-operation and friendship. The U.S. President Mr. Carter recently visited India. Besides, agreeing on sound peaceful projects, on 3rd January, 1978, U.S.A. and India pledged to work together for a work equitable

economic order "to bring out the eventual elimination of existing stockpiles of neuclear weapons and to arrest the danger of proliferation of these weapons". In his address before the Parliament of India, Mr. Carter spoke in high terms of praise about India. "I stand before you", he observed, n this House, the seat of one of the world's great legislatures, with feelings of profound friendship and respect....India has given her affirmative answer in a thunderous voice—a voice heard around the world. Something momentous happened here last March—not because any particular party won or lost, but rather, I think, because the largest electorate on earth freely and wisely chose its leaders at the polls. In this sense democracy itself was the victor." He referred to the progress of India since her Independence and referred to her difficulties. He pleaded for co-operation also between them to help the cause of international harmony and understanding.

The six-day official visit of British Prime Minister James Callaghan to India in January, 1978, is a significant event in modern Indo-British relation. On 9th January, 1978, Mr. Callaghan invited India to "a new era" of co-operation between the two countries for facing and solving together the problems of the world. Mr. Callaghan has made two important proposals regarding economic development. Britain is willing, he said, to assist India, Bangladesh and Nepal in exploitation of water resources in the eastern region of the sub-continent. Mr. Callaghan has also professed a kind of British aid that could be "dovetailed into the Indian Government's plan for greater emphasis on rural development".

1. India's Relations with the Soviet Union

The ties of friendship between India and the Soviet Union have gradually become stronger. Nehru selected highly distinguished persons to be India's Ambassadors to the Soviet Union to make the basis of Indo-Soviet friendship strong and firm. They were Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit, who was succeeded by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan and after him came Mr. K. P. S. Menon.

On almost all international issues the Soviet Union has been in agreement with India, and on matters concerning India, the attitude of the Soviet Union has been helpful.[1] On the Kāshmīr question, the Soviet Union extended "firm and steady" support to India. An important Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement was concluded on 2nd December, 1953. At the invitation of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru paid a visit to the Soviet Union. At Moscow he held talks with Mr. Bulganin, Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, and other members of the Soviet Government on matters of mutual interest to both

[1] P. Tharyan, *India: The Critical Decade after Nehru*, pp. 157-58.

the countries and on larger questions of international importance. Both the Prime Ministers issued a Joint Statement on 23rd June, 1955, affirming their profound faith in the five principles of *Pancha Sheel*, in the need for disarmament and for true co-existence, the essence of which, they stated, was that " States of different social structures can exist side by side in peace and concord and work for the common good." In response to an invitation extended by the Government of India, Mr. N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., Mr. N. S. Khrushchev, Member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., and other official representatives of the Soviet Union, visited India in November–December, 1955. Their visit was followed by a Joint Indo-Soviet Statement on 13th December, 1955, in which faith in the five principles of *Pancha Sheel* was reaffirmed. They declared " anew their faith in the future and their firm resolve to devote their energies to the promotion of peace for the benefit not only of the people of their two countries but of the world as a whole." They also issued, on the same date, a Joint Comminique on Economic Relations expressing " the desire of the two countries to develop economic co-operation and expand trade relations". The U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet passed a Resolution on 23rd December, 1955, on the visit of Bulganin and Khrushchev to India, Burma and Afghanistan to approve their activity " as being in full accord with the peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union and as contributing to international peace, friendship and co-operation."

The succeeding years have been marked by " consolidation and enlargement " of Indo-Soviet friendship. There was another Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement on 16th November, 1958.

A Joint Indo-Soviet Statement was issued on 6th February, 1960, in which both sides " expressed their gratification at the development of the relations between India and the Soviet Union in a spirit of goodwill and friendship as result of their common adherence to the principles of peaceful co-existence and active pursuit of peace." They " stressed the importance of disarmament as an essential prerequisite to a permanent and lasting peace and to the banishment of the fear of war ". Similar feelings and also satisfaction at the growth of co-operation in economic and cultural spheres were expressed in another Indo-Soviet Statement of 16th February, 1960.

There were " crisis and conflict " from 1962 to 1966 which came to an end by the Tashkent Declaration, which was due largely to the peaceful intervention of the Soviet Union. It has been rightly observed that: " In a way, Tashkent is an epitome of Indo-Soviet friendship—a friendship whose purpose is not to threaten or encircle any nation, but to promote the cause of peace in the world, more particularly in the South Asian region." The post-Tashkent years (1966–1970) saw further growth of Indo-Soviet friendship.

The Soviet Union showed grave concern over the developments in Bangladesh. On 2nd April, 1971, the Soviet President, Podgorny sent a

message to Yahya Khan strongly protesting against the atrocities perpetrated by Pakistān on the people of Bangladesh. Pakistān paid no heed to this. Soon after a highly significant step was taken by India and the Soviet Union when they concluded the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation which was signed at New Delhi on 9th August, 1971, between the Russian Foreign Minister Andre Gromyko and India's Foreign Minister, Swaran Singh.[1] The most important of the Articles of the Treaty was the Article which runs as follows: "Each High Contracting Party undertaken to abstain from giving any assistance to any third party that engages in an armed conflict with the other party. In the event of either party being subjected to attack or threat thereof, the High Contracting Parties should immediately enter into mutual consultations with a view of eliminating the threat and taking appropriate effective measures to ensure the peace and security of their countries."

There has been also close collaboration between India and the Soviet Union in the economic sphere. With the help of the Soviet Union, India has started some big projects like the steel plants at Bhilai and Bokaro and the heavy electricals plant at Hardwar. Trade between the two countries has been gradually increasing.

In the sphere of culture too Indo-Soviet friendship has produced fruitful results. Studies on Indian subjects are being pursued with great zeal in the educational institutions of the Soviet Union.

In June 1976, India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi who paid an official visit to the Soviet Union for six days and Mr Leonid Brezhnev, the Communist Party Chief of the Soviet Union, signed a Joint Declaration on development of friendship and co-operation. This is a highly significant affair.

2. Indo-Japanese Relations

Relations between India and Japan can be studied under three aspects—political, economic and cultural. So far as the political aspect is concerned, in the period from 1900 to 1922 though the people of India wanted to win Japanese support in their national struggle, the attitude of Japan was pro-British largely because of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902. But there was a change in the attitude of Japan towards India from 1922 to 1933. After the Washington Conference (1922) Japan's pro-British attitude disappeared and Japan did not want to help the British in suppressing the activities of the Indian revolutionaries in Japan led by Rāsh Behāry Bose, who worked hard there for India's freedom from 1923. But there was deterioration in Indo-Japanese political relations from 1931. During the Sino-Japanese war (1937–1939) India sympathized with China and the Indian National Congress passed several resolutions in favour of China.

[1]P. Tharyan, *op. cit.* pp. 161-63.

During the Second World War, Japan joined the Axis powers. The Pacific War made India vulnerable to Japanese attacks and the overrunning of South-East Asia by the Japanese army generated an anti-Japanese attitude in India. The Indians in South-East Asia formed the Indian National Army (I.N.A.) to effect liberation of India from British domination. Japan first encouraged it but within a few years her policy towards it was not commendable and the relation between Japan and Mohan Singh, Commander-in-Chief of the I.N.A., became strained. So Mohan Singh was arrested and the I.N.A. was dissolved. The I.N.A. was re-established after the arrival of Subhas Chandra Bose at Tokyo on 13th June, 1943. But he was also ultimately disillusioned.

After 1945, the relations between the two countries have been good. The Indo-Japanese Treaty of Peace was concluded in June, 1952. India's Vice-President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, went to Japan on a good-will mission in October, 1956, to develop commercial co-operation and promote cultural exchange between the two countries. In May, 1957, a good-will visit was paid to India by the Japanese Prime Minister N. Kishi. India's Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, visited Japan in the month of October of the same year. The visit to India of Japan's Crown Prince and Princess during December, 1960, strengthened Indo-Japanese friendship. Another Prime Minister of Japan, H. Ikeda, came to New Delhi in 1961. Since 1965 there have been occasional consultative meetings between the two countries, but no definite and spectacular results have come out of these, though there have been discussions on World Peace and Disarmament. India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, visited Japan in June, 1969.

The relation between the two countries in the economic sphere has been very important, and they have concluded several bilateral Trade Agreements. The trade relations between the two countries were suspended during the Second World War. But there has been revival of Trade Agreements after the War.

India and Japan had cultural relations since the days of remote antiquity, largely because of the influence of Buddhism in Japan. During the recent years their cultural relations have expanded, particularly after the signing of the Cultural Agreement of 1956, which has allowed for the exchange of Cultural delegations and scholars.

3. India's Relations with the United States

As one of the biggest world powers, the United States has played a highly important role in modern international affairs. She sympathized with India in her freedom struggle and was firmly in favour of India attaining independence. During one of his early trips to the United States, Jawaharlal Nehru observes:

The United States of America is not an unknown country even in far-off India. And many of us have grown up in admiration of the ideals and objectives which have made this country great. Yet, though we may know the history and something of the culture of our respective countries, what is required is a true understanding and appreciation of each other even when we differ. Out of that understanding grows fruitful co-operation in the pursuit of common ideals.

But unfortunately this has not become possible in the background of complicated world politics of the recent years and relations between India and the United States " have fluctuated heavily over the years ".[1] The United States promptly announced assistance to India during the Sino-India conflict. But differences between the two countries continued because of certain factors, one of these being the support and military aid which the United States gave to Pakistān. There was some improvement in mutual understanding when India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi visited the United Sates in March, 1966.

The United States have given substantial economic help to India. Upto 1972 India got more than Rs. 3,500 crores as aid from the United States. But this did not help create an atmosphere of perfect good-will. Nixon's attitude to help Pakistān during the reign of terror in East Pakistān caused by Yahya Khan's atrocities and the dubbing of the popular uprising there as a rebellion, and India as the aggressor, made the relations more strained. Indira Gandhi expressed her resentment at this attitude of the United States in a letter addressed to Nixon on 15th December, 1971. But in spite of this, there was no change in Nixon's policy. The relations between India and the United States grew cooler.

Mr. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, after staying in India as United States' Ambassador for about two years, observed in a farewell interview in December, 1974 that Indo-American relations are thin and getting thinner. " We like each other...but there is not much there. We have gone from the stage where we were over-involved in India, to where we now pretend it doesn't exist. In the past, our relations were volatile and unstable, up and down. We've now reached a kind of plateau. We've regressed to a kind of stable perception of one another." But there is growing realization of the need for a frank and clear understanding between the two countries as is evidenced by three-day visit to Delhi of Dr. Kissinger, U.S. Secretary of State. After talks here an Indo-U.S. Joint Communique was issued on 30th October 1974, which said:

' The cordial and frank nature of the discussions during the U.S. Secretary of States' visit reflected the desire and interest of both countries in broadening the basis of their relationship and in strengthening the many contacts

[1]P. Tharyan, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

and ties between the Indian and American people. During the discussions there was an exchange of views on various aspects of bilateral relations, the situation in South Asia and neighbouring regions and a review of the global situation, including the world economic situation.

To strengthen further the friendly relations between both countries, they agreed to constitute a Joint Commission, which would review Economic and Commercial Co-operation, Scientific and Technological Co-operation, and Education and Cultural Co-opeation.

4. India's Relations with the Arab Countries

There has been friendship between India and Egypt. Nasser's death on 28th September, 1970, was widely mourned in India.

India's relations with the Arab States have been friendly. During the crisis in West Asia, India extended support to the Arabs. In the Arab-Israel conflict the Government of India consistently supported the cause of the Arabs, though India does not consider Israel to be a foe. The West Asian policy of the Government of India was subject to criticism during and after the war in Bangladesh as none of the Arab States supported Bangladesh and were sympathetic towards Pakistān. In spite of this attitude the Government of India maintained friendly relation with the Arab States and she supported the Arabs during the 1973 war.

GENEALOGICAL TABLES TO PART III

THE NAWĀBS OF OUDH



THE GÁIKWÁR FAMILY



THE HOLKAR FAMILY




THE BHONSLAS (Nāgpur)
Mudhojī
Bapujī
Parsojī
Bimbajī
Kanhojī
Raghūjī I (1738–1755)
Mudhojī
Janojī
Others
Raghūjī II adopted by Janojī (1788–1816)
Vyankojī
Parsojī
Mudhojī (Appa Sāheb)
Raghūjī III (1818–1853)


THE SINDHIA FAMILY
Minā Bāī
Ranojī Sindhia (1726–1750)
a Rājput Lady of Mālwa
Jey pāt (Jayappa) d. 1759
Dattājī
Jotiba
Jānkojī (killed at Pānīpat almost immediately after accession to power).
Mādhava Rāo Sindhia d. 1794
Tukojī (died on the field of Pānīpat)
Kedarji
Jyotaba
Anand Rāo
Daulat Rāo Sindhia (1794–1827)
Jankojī Rāo (1827–1843)
Jayajī Rāo (1843–1886)
Mādhava Rāo II (1886–1925)
Jivajī Rāo (1925–

MAHĀRĀJĀ RANJIT SINGH'S FAMILY



THE DURRĀNĪ SHĀHS



THE NIZĀMS OF HYDERABAD

Khwāja Abid Kabj Khān (Governor of Ajmer)

Mir Shihāb-ud-dīn, Ghāzi-ud-dīn Khan Fīrūz Jang (Governor of Gujarāt)

1. Mir Qamār-ud-dīn, Nizām-ul-mulk Asaf Jāh
Created Subahdār of the Deccan by the Mughul Emperor Farrukhsiyar, 1713.
Became practically independent 1724 (1713–1748).

- Ghāzī-ud-dīn Khān
  - Ghāzī-ud-dīn Imād-ul-Mulk
- 2. Mīr Muhammad Nāsir Jang (1748–1750)
- 3. Mīr Āsaf-ud-daulah Salābat Jang (1751–1761)
- 4. Nizām 'Alī (1762–1803)
  - 5. Mīr Akbar 'Alī Khān Sikandar Jah (1802–1829)
    - 6. Nāsir-ud-daulah Farkhundah 'Alī Khān (1829–1857)
      - 7. Afzul-ud-daulah (1857–1869)
        - 8. Mīr Mahbub 'Alī Khān (1869–1911)
          - 9. H.E.H. Nawab Mīr Usmān Alī Khān Bahādur Fateh Jang (1911–)
- Mīr Shujā-ul-mulk Basālat Jang
- daughter
  - Muzaffar Jang (1750–1751)

THE NAWÂBS OF ARCOT

1. Zulf'iqar 'Âlî Khân
Created Nawâb of the Carnatic by the Emperor Aurangzeb
(c. A.D. 1690–1703)

2. Dâûd Khân
(A.D. 1703–1710)

Agibattî Muhammad Khân

3. Muhammad Sayyid Sa'âdat-ullah Khân I (1710–1732)

Ghulâm 'Âlî Khân

4. Dost 'Âlî Khân (1732–1740)

Husain

5. Safdar 'Âlî Khân (1740–1742)

6. Sa'âdat-ullah Khân II 'Muhammad Sayyid' (1742–1744)

Dau. md. Ghulâm Murtazâ 'Âlî

Sâhib Jadda (Zada)

Dau. md. Cihanda Sâhib, alias Husain DostKhân (1749)

Râjâ Sâhib (1759)

7. Anwâr-ud-dîn Muhammad
Appointed Nâwâb by Nizâm-ul-mulk
Rival Chanda Sâhib. (1744–1749)

Mahfuz Khân

8. Wala Jâh Muhammad 'Âlî (1749–1795)

'Abdul Rahim

'Abdul Wahab

Nâjib-ullah

9. Omdut-ul-Umarâ (1795–1801)

10. 'Âlî Hussain

Amîr-ul-Umarâ

'Azîm-ud-daulah (1801–1819)

11. 'Azam Jâh (1819–1825)

12. 'Azîm Jâh Bahâdur 'Prince of Arcot' (1867–1874)

THE NAWĀBS OF BENGAL SUBAH



BARAKZĀI WĀZIRS AND AMĪRS



BIBILIOGRAPHY TO PART III

General

1. Cambridge History of India, Vols. V and VI.
2. Dupleix and Clive—H. Dodwell.
3. History of British India—P. E. Roberts.. (Second edition.)
4. History of India (British Period)—Rushbrook Williams.
5. History of India under Queen Victoria—Trotter.
6. India under Wellesley—P. E. Roberts.
7. Last Days of the Company—Anderson and Subedar.
8. Making of British India—Ramsay Muir.
9. Oxford History of India—V. A. Smith.
10. Rise and Expansion of the British Dominion in India—Sir Alfred Lyall.
11. Sketch of the History of India from 1858 to 1918—H. H. Dodwell. (1925.)
12. The Chronology of Modern India—Dr. James Burgess.
13. The First British Empire—A. Berriedale Keith.
14. The Navy in India—Richmond.
15. History and Culture of the Indian People, Vols. IX, X. (Published by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.)

Special

Book I—Chapter I

1. Anglo-Portuguese Negotiations relating to Bombay, 1660–1677—Shaafat Ahmad Khan. (1922.)
2. Annals of the East India Company, 3 vols.—John Bruce. (1810.)
3. Aurangzeb and His Times, Vol. V—Sir J. N. Sarkar.
4. British Beginnings in Western India—H. G. Rawlinson. (Oxford, 1920.)
5. Calendar of Madras Records, 1740–1744—H. H. Dodwell. (Madras, 1917.)
6. Commercial Relations between India and England—Bal Krishna. (1924.)
7. Dawn of British Trade to the East Indies—Sir George Birdwood. (London, 1886.)

8. Diary of William Hedges, edited by Col. H. Yule, 3 vols. (Hakluyt Society, 1877–1879.)
9. Dutch-Asiatic Trade, 1620–1740—Crist of Glamann. (1958.)
10. The Dutch East India Company and Mysore—J. Van Lohuizen. (1961.)
11. Early Annals of the English in Bengal, 3 vols.—C. R. Wilson. (Calcutta, 1895–1917.)
12. Early Records of British India—J. T. Wheeler. (Calcutta, 1878.)
13. East India Trade in the Seventeenth Century—Shaafat Ahmad Khan. (1923.)
14. English Factories in India, 1618–1669, 13 vols.—W. Foster. (Oxford, 1906–1927.)
15. From Akbar to Aurangzeb—W. H. Moreland. (1913.)
16. History of Bengal—Stewart.
17. History of British India, 2 vols.—Sir William Hunter. (1899–1900)
18. History of the European Commerce with India—D. Macpherson. (1872.)
19. History of the French in India—Col. G. B. Malleson.
20. History of the Portuguese in India, 2 vols.—F. G. Danvers. (1894.)
21. India at the Death of Akbar—W. H. Moreland. (1920.)
22. Jan Company in Coromandel, 1605–1690—Tapan Raychaudhuri. (Published in 1962.)
23. Madras in the Olden Times, 3 vols.—J. T. Wheeler. (Madras, 1861–1862.)
24. Monumental Remains of the Dutch E. I. Coy. in the Presidency of Madras—A. Rea. (Arch. Sur. of India, New Imp. Ser., Vol. XXV. Madras, 1897.)
25. New Account of the East Indies, 2 vols.—Capt. Alexander Hamilton. (Edinburgh, 1927.)
26. Old Fort William in Bengal, 2 vols.—C. R. Wilson. (1906.)
27. Oriental Commerce, 2 vols.—W. Milburn. (1813.)
28. Portuguese in Bengal—J. J. A. Campos. (Calcutta, 1919.)
29. Portuguese in India and Arabia between 1507 and 1517—E. D. Ross. (Printed in Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1921, Part II.)
30. Publications of the Madras Record Office, edited by H. H. Dodwell and Krishnaswami Aiyanger.
31. Rise of Bombay—S. M. Edwardes. (Bombay, 1902.)
32. Rise of the Portuguese Power in India, 1497–1550—R. S. Whiteway. (1899.)
33. Selections from the Records of the Madras Govt. Dutch Records, edited by the Rev. Fathers A. J. van der Burg, P. Groot and J. Fruictier, and A. Galletti, I.C.S. 15 vols.
34. Trade and Commercial Organisation in Bengal, 1650–1720—Sushil Chaudhuri.

35. Vasco da Gama and his Successors—K. G. Jayne. (1910.)
36. Vestiges of Old Madras—Colonel H. D. Love. (1913.)

Book I—Chapter II

1. Abstract of the Early Records of the Foreign Department, 1756–1762—S. C. Hill (Calcutta, 1901.)
2. Bengal in 1756–1757, 3 vols.—S. C. Hill. (1905.)
3. Bengal: Past and Present, 1915, 1916, 1918, 1925.
4. Bengal and Madras Papers, 3 vols. –G. B. Forrest. (Calcutta.)
5. Bengal Government Records: Proceedings of the Select Committee, 1758, edited by W. K. Firminger.
6. Calendar of the Madras Despatches, 1744–1755—H. H. Dodwell. (Madras, 1920.)
7. Calendar of Persian Correspondence, Vols. I–III. (Calcutta, 1911–1919.)
8. Catalogue of the Orme Manuscripts—S. C. Hill. (Oxford, 1916.)
9. Comprehensive History of India, 3 vols.—Henry Beveridge. (1867.)
10. Considerations on Indian Affairs, 1772–1775—William Bolts.
11. Dupleix—Prosper Cultru. (Paris, 1901.)
12. Dupleix and Clive—Dodwell.
13. Historical Sketches of the South of India, 3 vols.—M. Wilks. (1810–1817.)
14. History of the British Empire in India, 6 vols.—Edward Thornton. (1841.)
15. History of British India—James Mill. With notes and continuation by H. H. Wilson. 10 vols. (1858.)
16. History of the French in India—Col. G. B. Malleson.
17. History of the Madras Army, 5 vols.—Col. W. J. Wilson. (Madras.)
18. History of the Military Transactions of the British Nation in Indostan, 3 vols.—Robert Orme. (1803 edition.)
19. India Tracts—J. Z. Holwell. (2nd edition, 1764.)
20. Life of Lord Clive—Col. G. B. Malleson. (1907.)
21. Life of Lord Clive, 2 vols.—Sir G. W. Forrest. (1918.)
22. Life of Robert Lord Clive, 3 vols.—Sir John Malcolm. (1836.)
23. Life of Robert Lord Clive, 4 vols.—C. Carraccioli. (1777.)
24. Lord Clive's Right-hand Man—Col. Lionel Forde. (1910.)
25. Memoir of M. Jean Law, edited by Prof. A. Martineau. (Paris, 1913.)
26. Memoirs of the Revolution in Bengal in the year 1757—William Watts. (1760.)
27. Mémoires sur l'Indoustan—Gentil. (1822.)
28. Mir Jafar—A. C. Roy.
29. Narrative of Anglo-French Conflicts—Lawrence.

30. Narrative of the Transactions in Bengal, 3 vols.—Henry Vansittart. (1760.)
31. Narrative of what happened in Bengal in the year 1760—John Caillaud.
32. Original Papers relating to the Disturbances in Bengal, 1759–1764—Henry Vansittart. (1765.)
33. Private Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai, edited by Price and Dodwell, 12 vols. (Madras, 1904–1928.) (The tranlastion published in the Journal of Indian History since 1928 may also be studied with profit.)
34. Reflections on the Government of Indostan—Luke Scrafton. (1763.)
35. Rise and Progress of the Bengal Army—A. Broome. (Calcutta, 1850.)
36. Rise and Progress of the British Power in India, 2 vols.—Peter Auber. (1837.)
37. Rise, Progress and Present State of the English Government in Bengal —Harry Verelst. (1772.)
38. Riyāz-us-salātin—Ghulām Husain Salim. (English translation.)
39. Selections from the Unpublished Records of the Government of Bengal, 1748–1767—Rev. J. Long. (Calcutta, 1869.)
40. Siyar-ul-mutakherin—Ghulām Husain. (English translation.)
41. Three Frenchmen in Bengal—S. C. Hill. (1903.)
42. Voyage to India—E. Ives. (1773.)

Book I—Chapter III

1. Calendar of Persian Correspondence, Vol. IV. (Calcutta, 1925.)
2. Collection of Treaties, Engagements, Sunnuds relating to India, 9 vols.—Sir C. Atchison. (1909.)
3. Correspondence of Cornwallis, 3 vols.—Charles Ross. (1859.)
4. Debates of the House of Lords on the evidence delivered in the trial of Warren Hastings. (1797.)
5. Edward Thornton, op. cit.
6. Ghulām Husain, op. cit.
7. Haider Ali—N. K. Sinha. (2nd edition, 1949.)
8. Hastings and Philip Francis—Sophia Weitzman.
9. Hastings in Bengal, 1772–1774—M. E. Monckton-Jones. (Oxford, 1918.)
10. Hastings and the Rohilla War—Sir John Strachey. (1892.)
11. Historical Relation of the Origin, Progress, and Final Dissolution of the Government of the Rohilla Afghans—C. Hamilton. (1787.)
12. Historical Sketches of the South of India, 3 vols.—Mark Wilks. (1810–1817.)
13. History of the Mahrattas—Grant Duff. (Edwardes' edition.)

14. History of the Mahrattas—E. S. Warring. (1810.)
15. History of the Maratha People, 3 vols.—C. A. Kincaid and D. B. Parsinis. (1918–1925.)
16. History of the Trial of Warren Hastings. (1796.)
17. Hyder Ali and Tipu Sultan—M.L.D.T.
18. Hyder Ali and Tipu Sultan—Bowring.
19. James Mill, op. cit.
20. Jonathan Duncan and Varapasi—V. A. Nasain. (Calcutta, 1959.)
21. Letters of Warren Hastings to Sir John Macpherson—H. H. Dodwell. (1927.)
22. Life of Hastings—Sir Alfred Lyall. (1908.)
23. Lord Clive's Speech in the House of Commons, 30th March, 1772.
24. Main Currents of Maratha History—G. S. Sardesai. (1933 edition.)
25. Memoirs of Warren Hastings, 3 vols.—G. R. Gleig. (1841.)
26. Nuncomar and Impey, 2 vols.—Sir J. F. Stephen. (1885.)
27. Peter Auber, op. cit.
28. Selections from the Letters, Despatches, and other State Papers preserved in the Foreign Department of the Government of India, 1772–1785, 3 vols.—Sir G. W. Forrest. (Calcutta, 1890.)
29. Selections from the State Papers of the Governors-General of India. Warren Hastings, 2 vols.—Sir G. W. Forrest. (Oxford, 1910.)
30. Selections, etc. Cornwallis, 2 vols.—Sir G. W. Forrest.
31. Selections from the Letters, Despatches and State Papers preserved in the Bombay Secretariat—Sir G. W. Forrest. (Bombay, 1885 and 1887.)
32. Speech on the Nabob of Arcot's Debts, with an appendix containing several documents—Edmund Burke. (1788.)
33. Transactions in India, 1756–1783—John Moir. (1786.)
34. Trial of Nand Kumar—H. Beveridge. (1886.)
35. View of the English interests in India; and an account of the military operations in the southern parts of the peninsula, during the campaigns of 1782, 1783, and 1784—William Fullarton. (1787.)
36. Warren Hastings and his Accusers—P. F. Roberts (Journal of Indian History, March, 1924.)

Book I—Chapter IV

1. Account of the Campaign in Mysore, 1799—Capt. A. Allan. Edited by N. C. Sinha. (Calcutta, 1913.)
2. Anglo-Maratha Relations, 1785–1796—S. N. Sen.
3. Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan—Tod. (Crooke's edition.)
4. Asiatic Annual Register, 1800–1811.
5. Asiatic Journal, 1816–1829.

6. Baji Rao II and the East India Company, 1796–1818—Pratul Chandra Gupta. (2nd revised edition, 1964.)
7. Despatches, Minutes and Correspondence of Marquess Wellesley, 5 vols.—Montgomery Martin. (1836.)
8. Despatches of...the Duke of Wellington, 13 vols.—Lt. Col. J. Gurwood. (1834–1939.)
9. European Military Adventurers of Hindustan, 1784–1803—Herbert Compton. (1892.)
10. The French in India 1763–1876—S. P. Sen. (1958.)
11. Historical Records of Baroda—B. A. Gupta. (Calcutta.)
12. Historical Sketches of the South of India, 3 vols.—Mark Wilks. (1810–1817.)
13. History of the Mahrattas—Grant Duff. (Edwardes' edition.)
14. History of the Military and Political Transactions in India during the administration of the Marquess of Hastings, 1813–1823, 2 vols. —Henry T. Prinsep. (1825.)
15. History of Persia, 2 vols.—Sir P. M. Sykes. (1922.)
16. Jaswant Rao Holica—S. Qanungo. (1965.)
17. History of the Reign of Shah Aulum—W. Francklin. (1798.)
18. Journey from Bengal to England through the northern parts of India, 2 vols.—George Forster. (1808.)
19. Life of Elphinstone, 2 vols.—Sir H. T. Colebrooke. (1884.)
20. Life of Sir Thomas Munro, 3 vols. —G. R. Gleig. (1830.)
21. Life and Correspondence of Charles Lord Metcalfe—J. W. Kaye. (1855.)
22. Life of Sir John Malcolm, 2 vols.—J. W. Kaye. (1856.)
23. Lord Minto in India—Lady Minto. (1880.)
24. Mahratta and Pindari War, compiled from the General Staff, India. (Simla, 1910.)
25. Marquess Wellesley—W. H. Hutton.
26. Marquess Wellesley—W. M. Torrens. (1850.)
27. Memoir of Central India, 2 vols.—Sir John Malcolm. (3rd edition, 1832.)
28. Narrative of the Operations of Captain Little's Detachment—Edward Moore. (1794.)
29. Oriental Memoirs—J. Forbes. (2nd edition, 1834.)
30. Papers relating to the Napaul War. Printed by the East India Company.
31. Political History of India from 1784 to 1823—Sir John Malcolm. (1826.)
32. Select Letters of Tippo Sultan—Col. W. Kirkpatrick. (London, 1811.)
33. Selections from the Asiatic Journal, 2 vols. (Madras, 1875.)
34. Selections from the Letters, Despatches, and other State Papers preserved in the Bombay Secretariat—Sir G. W. Forrest.

35. Selections from the minutes...of Mountstuart Elphinstone—Sir G. W. Forrest. (1884.)
36. Shāh Alam II and the East India Company—K. K. Datta. (World Press Private Limited, Calcutta, 1966.)
37. Tipu Sultan—Mohibul Hasan Khan. (1951.)
38. Views in the Mysore Country—Capt. A. Allan. (1794.)
39. Wellesley Despatches—Owen.
40. Wellesley Papers, 2 vols.—Montgomery Martin. (1914.)
41. Wellington Despatches—Owen.

Book I—Chapter V

1. Annexation of Sind—Khera.
2. Banu or Our Afghan Frontier—S. S. Thorburn. (1876.)
3. Bengal: Past and Present, 1926.
4. British Burma Gazetteer, 2 vols. (Rangoon, 1880.)
5. British Relations with Sind, 1799–1843—Robert A. Huttenback. (University of California Press, 1962.)
6. Burma, Past and Present, 2 vols.—A. Fytche. (London, 1878.)
7. Burma, Under British Rule and Before, 2 vols.—J. Nisbet. (London, 1901.)
8. Calcutta Review, 1852.
9. Campaigns on North-West Frontier, 1849–1908—H. L. Nevill. (1912.)
10. Conquest of Sind—Sir William Napier. (1845.)
11. Dalhousie in India, 1848–1856—Suresh Chandra Ghosh.
12. Earl of Auckland—L. J. Trotter. (R.I., 1905.)
13. Embassy to the Kingdom of Ava—Michael Symes. (1800. Reprinted in 1831.)
14. England and Afghanistan—Dilip Kumar Ghose. (Calcutta, 1960.)
15. Essays on the External Policy of India—J. W. S. Wyllie. (1875.)
16. First Afghan War and its Causes—Sir Henry Marion Durand. (1879.)
17. Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States, 5 vols.—J. G. Scott and J. P. Hardiman. (Rangoon, 1900.)
18. Indo-Afghan Relations, 1800-1900—Ram Sagar Rastogi. (Lucknow, 1965.)
19. Hazara Gazetteer—H. D. Watson. (1907.)
20. History of Assam—Sir Ed. Gait.
21. History of the Afghans—J. P. Ferrier. (1858.)
22. History of British India—Murray. (1857.)
23. History of British India—Macfarlane. (1862.)
24. History of Burma—Sir Arthur Phayre. (1883.)
25. History of Burma—G. E. Harvey. (London, 1925.)

26 History of Persia, Vol. II—Sykes.
27. History of the Punjab—Latiff. (1891.)
28. History of the Sikhs—Cunningham.
29. History of General Sir Charles Napier's Administration of Scinde—Sir William Napier. (1851.)
30. History of the Indian Administration of Lord Ellenborough—Lord Colchester. (London, 1874.)
31. History of the War in Afghanistan, 3 vols.—Kaye. (4th edition, 1878.)
32. India and Her Neighbours—W. P. Andrew. (1878.)
33. Indian Frontier Policy—J. M. Adye. (1897.)
34. Indian Historical Quarterly, June, 1933.
35. John Russell Colvin—Sir A. Colvin. (R.I., 1911.)
36. Journal of Indian History, 1921-22.
37. Journal of Indian History, April–June, 1933.
38. Journal of the Department of Letters, Vol. X. (Calcutta University.)
39. Life of the Marquis of Dalhousie, 2 vols.—Lee-Warner. (1904.)
40. Life of Munro, Vol. II—Gleig.
41. Macfarlane, op. cit.
42. Modern Review, 1925.
43. Narrative of the Burmese War—Major Snodgrass. (London, 1827.)
44. Narrative of the War in Afghanistan, 2 vols.—H. Havelock. (1840.)
45. Our Burmese Wars and Relations with Burma—Colonel W.P.B. Laurie. (1880.)
46. Oxus and the Indus—Major Evans Bell. (1869.)
47. Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission, 1927.
48. Ranjit Singh—Sir Lepel Griffin.
49. Ranjit Singh—Dr. N. K. Sinha.
50. Report showing the Relations of the British Government with the Tribes on the North-West Frontier of the Punjab—R. H. Davies. (1864.)
51. Report showing the Relations of the British Government with the Tribes on the North-West Frontier—R. G. Temple. (1856.)
52. Report of the North-West Frontier Committee (Bray Committee). (1921.)
53. Report on Certain Frontier Tribes—R. Warburton. (1877.)
54. Rise of the Sikh Power—Dr. N. K. Sinha.
55. Russia, Central Asia and British India—J. Long. (1865.)
56. Scinde in the Forties—Colonel Keith Young. Edited by Arthur Scott.
57. Sikhs and the Sikh Wars—Sir Charles Gough and A. D. Innes. (1897.)
58. Sir Charles Napier and Sind. H.T. Lambrick. (O.U.P., 1952.)
59. Thornton, op. cit. Vols. V, VI.

60. Transformation of Sikkism—Narang.
61. Wellesley Despatches—Owen.
62. Wellington Despatches—Owen.

Book I—Chapter VI

1. Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, 3 vols.—Tod. (Crooke's edition)
2. The Annexation of Assam—R. M. Lahiri. (Jalpaiguri, 1954.)
3. Assam in the Days of the Company, 1826–1858—H. K. Barpujari. (Gauhati, 1963.)
4. Constitutional History of India—A. B. Keith.
5. Evolution of British Policy towards Indian States, 1774–1858—K. M. Pannikar. (The Calcutta University Readership Lectures, 1929.)
6. History of the Mahrattas—Grant Duff. (Edwardes' edition.)
7. India and Its Native Princes—Louis Rousselet.
8. Indian Constitutional Documents—P. Mukherjee.
9. Indian Statutory Commission's Report, Vols. I, II.
10. Indo-Afghan Relations, 1947–67—Hasan Ali Sha Jafri.
11. Introduction to the Study of the Relations of Indian States with the Government of India—K. M. Pannikar. (1927.)
12. Life of Dalhousie, Vol. II—Lee-Warner.
13. Lord Hastings and the Indian States—Mehta.
14. Memoir of Central India, Vols. I and II—Malcolm.
15. Montagu-Chelmsford Report.
16. Native States of India—Lee-Warner. (1910.)
17. Political and Military Transactions of the British in India, 2 vols.—Prinsep.
18. Proceedings of the Round Table Conferences.
19. Treaties, Engagements and Sunnuds, 9 vols.—Sir C. Atchison. (1909.)

Book I—Chapter VII

1. (a) Biography of Kunwar Singh. (b) History of Freedom Movement in Bihar, Vols. I, II and III—K. K. Datta.
2. Causes of the Indian Revolt—Sayyid Ahmad Khan. (Benares, 1873.)
3. Cawnpore—Sir G.O. Trevelyan. (1865.)
4. Civil Disturbances during the British Rule (1765–1857)—S. B. Chaudhuri. (Calcutta, 1955.)
5. Communism in India, 1935–45—edited by S. Roy.
6. Eighteen Fifty-Seven—S. N. Sen.
7. History of the Indian Mutiny, 2 vols.—Charles Ball.

8. History of the Indian Mutiny, 3 vols.—Forrest. (1904–1912.)
9. History of the Indian Mutiny—T. R. Holmes. (5th edition, 1904.)
10. History of the Sepoy War in India, 6 vols.—Kaye and Malleson. (1864–1880.)
11. Indian Mutiny of 1857—Malleson. (1891.)
12. Indian Mutiny in Perspective—Sir George MacMunn. (1931.)
13. Life of John Nicholson—L. J. Trotter. (1904.)
14. Life of John Russell Colvin—Sir Auckland Colvin. (1895.)
15. Nana Saheb and the Rising at Cawnpore—Pratul Chandra Gupta. (O.U.P., 1963.)
16. Punjab Government Records, Mutiny Correspondence, 2 vols. (Lahore, 1911); The Mutiny Reports, 2 vols. (Lahore, 1911.)
17. Recent Writings on the Revolt of 1857—K. K. Sen
18. Records of the Intelligence Department, North-Western Provinces, 2 vols.—Sir William Muir. (1902.)
19. Selections from the Letters, Despatches, and other State Papers in the Military Department of the Government of India, 1757–1758, 4 vols.—Forrest. (Calcutta, 1893-1912.)
20. Sepoy Revolt—Innes. (1897.)
21. The Sepoy Mutiny and Revolt of 1857—R. C. Majumdar. (2nd edition, 1963.)
22. Theories of the Indian Mutiny, 1859—S. B. Chudhuri. (Calcutta, 1965.)

Book II—Chapter VIII

1. Bangladesh—Sheikh Mujibur Rehman. (Dacca, 1972.)
2. Cabinet Mission in India—A. C. Banerjee. (1946.)
3. Congress and the War Crisis—Acharya Jugal Kishore.
4. Congress Ministries at Work (April, 1946–April, 1947)—Acharya Jugal Kishore.
5. Constituent Assembly of India—A. C. Banerjee.
6. Contemporary India and Its Modernisation—S. C. Dube.
7. Discovery of India—Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.
8. India Divided—Dr. Rajendra Prasad.
9. India in World Affairs, 1957–58—A. Appadorai and V. K. Arora.
10. India in World Politics—B. N. Khanna. (1939.)
11. India since Cripps—Horace Alexander.
12. India: The Critical Decade after Nehru—P. Tharyan. (1974.)
13. India Today—R. Palme Dutt (1947.)
14. India, A Restatement—R. Coupland. (1945.)
15. Indo-Soviet Relations, 1947–1972—Dr. Bimal Prasad. (1973.)
16. Indian Constitutional Documents—A. C. Banerjee, Vols. I and II.

17. Indian Economics—Jathar and Beri. Vols. I and II, latest edition.
18. Indian Economy during the War—L. C. Jain (1944.)
19. Indian Education, Past and Present—Sir Philip Hartog.
20. My Experiments with Truth—Mahatma Gandhi.
21. Report on the Constitutional Problem in India—R. Coupland. Part I (Reprinted 1945.) Part II (Reprinted 1944.)
22. Social Problems (Oxford Pamphlet)—S. Natarajan. (3rd edition, 1944.)
23. The Constitution of Free India—Mritunjay Banerjee. (1947.)
24. The Cripps Mission—R. Coupland. (July, 1942.)
25. The Making of the Indian Constitution—A. C. Banerjee.
26. The Position of Women (Oxford Pamphlet)—Lakshmi N. Menon. (1945.)
27. The Way Out—C. Rajagopalachari. (November, 1943.)
28. War and India's Freedom—Acharya Jugal Kishore.

REPORTS, GOVERNMENT PAPERS AND JOURNALS, ETC.

1. Papers Relating to the Cabinet Mission to India, 1946. Published by the Government of India in 1946.
2. Statistics Relating to India's War Effort. Government of India, Department of Commerce, February, 1947.
3. Recent Social and Economic Trends in India. Published by the Government of India, October, 1945 (Revised edition).
4. Post-War Educational Development in India (Report by the Central Advisory Board of Education, January, 1944). Pamphlet No. 27, Bureau of Education, India, Fifth edition, 1947.
5. First Report on the Progress of Reconstruction Planning, March, 1944. Published by the Government of India, 1945.
6. Report of the Advisory Planning Board, June, 1947. Published by the Government of India.

6A. Report of the Economic Programme Committee (A.J.C.C.).

7. Review of the Trade in India year to year. Published by the Government of India.
8. The Indian Annual Register, year by year. Calcutta.
9. The India Quarterly. Published by the India Council of World Affairs, New Delhi.
10. The Asiatic Review, incorporating Proceedings of the East India Association, London.
11. The Eastern Economist, New Delhi, 4th January, 1946 (Trade in Industrial and Reconstructional policy).

    28th June, 1946 (Our Export Trade).
    15th November, 1946 (War and Agriculture.)
    1947—(Special Number) Industry, Trade, Labour (3rd January.)
    (Independence Number) The Indian States and India's Foreign Policy (15th August.)
    Trade in 1946 (7th November).
    1948—India and the United Nations (Special number and Industrial Reviews) (22nd January).
    The Factories Bill (13th February).
    The Indian States (26th March).
    Industrial Policy (9th April).

Government of India's Industrial Policy (16th April).
The Havana Charter (21st May).
Policy of Trade Unions (28th May).
Tariff Policy and Practice (11th June).
India's Foreign Policy, and India and Sterling (2nd July).

12. The Modern Review.

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO CHAPTERS ON CONSTITUTIONAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND ECONOMIC HISTORY IN PART III

1. A Bengal Zamindar: Jayakrishna Mukherjee of Uttarpara and His Times, 1808–1888—Nilmoni Mukherjee.
2. Administration of the East India Company—Sir J W. Kaye. (1853.)
3. Annals of Rural Bengal—Hunter.
4. A Rule of Property for Bengal—Ranajit Guha. (Paris, Mouton & Co., 1962.)
5. British Social Life in India, 1608–1937—Dennis Kincail.
6. Bengal Subah, 1740–1770—K. K. Datta. (1936.)
7. Bengal under the Lieutenant-Governors from 1854 to 1898—C. F. Buckland. (1901.)
8. British Policy in India 1858–1905—S. Gopal. (Cambridge University Press, 1965.)
9. Constitutional History of India—A. B. Keith. (1937.)
10. Constitutional System of India—N. C. Roy. (1938.)
11. Cornwallis in Bengal—Aspinall. (1931.)
12. A Diplomat Speaks—K. P. S. Menon.
13. District Gazetteers and Settlement Reports.
14. Early Revenue History of Bengal and the Fifth Report—F. D. Ascoli.
15. Economic Annals of Bengal—J. C. Sinha. (1927.)
16. Economic Consequences of the Great War—Panandikar. (1921.)
17. Economic Development of India—Vera Anstey. (1929.)
18. Economic Development of the Overseas Empire—Mrs. H. C. A. Knowles. (1920.)
19. Economic History of Bengal, Vol. I (1956); Vol. II (1962), Dr. N. K. Sinha.
20. Evolution of British Policy towards Indian States, 1774–1858—K. M. Pannikar. (1929.)
21. Famines and Land Assessments in India—R. C. Dutta. (1900.)
22. Fifth Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons, edited by W. K. Firminger. (Calcutta, 1917.)
23. Finances and Public Works of India, 1869–1881—Sir John and Sir Richard Strachey. (1882.)
24. Government of India—J. Ramsay MacDonald. (1920.)
25. Government of India—Sir Courtenay Ilbert. (1922.)

26. Government of India Act, 1935.
27. History and Constitution of the Legislative Authorities of British India—Herbert Cowell. (Calcutta, 1905.)
28. Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol. III (Economic), Vol. IV (Administrative).
29. India: Its Administration and Progress—Sir John Strachey. (1903.)
30. India in 1917–1918 to India in 1933–1934.
31. India as I Knew It, 1885–1925—Sir Michael O'Dwyer. (1925.)
32. India in the Victorian Age—R. C. Dutta. (1906, 2nd edition.)
33. India under Early British Rule—R. C. Dutta. (1908, 5th edition.)
34. India's Foreign Trade since 1870—Dr. P. Ray.
35. Indian Administration—G. N. Joshi. (1937.)
36. Indian Civil Service, 1601–1930—L. S. S. O'Malley. (1931.)
37. Indian Constitutional Documents, 2 vols.—P. Mukherjee. (1918.)
38. Indian Constitutional History—W. A. J. Archbold. (1926.)
39. Indian Constitutional Problems—Sir P. C. Sivaswami Ayer.
40. India: The Critical Trade after Nehru—P. Tharyan.
41. Indian Economics, 2 vols.—Jathar and Beri.
42. Indian Foreign Policy: The Nehru Era—edited by B. R. Nande.
43. Indian Polity—George Chesney. (1868.)
44. Indian Railways—N. B. Mehta.
45. Indian Year Book, from year to year, till 1940.
46. Industrial Evolution in India—Gadgil. (1924.)
47. Internal Market of India (1834–1900)—Tarasankar Banerjee.(1966.)
48. Introduction to the Study of the Relations of Indian States with the Government of India—K. M. Pannikar.
49. John Company at Work—Holden Furber. (1951.)
50. Justice and Police in Bengal, 1765-1793—N. Majumdar. (1960.)
51. Land Revenue Administration in India—S. C. Ray.
52. Life of the Marquis of Dalhousie, 2 vols.—Sir William Lee-Warner. (1904.)
53. Lord Curzon in India—Sir J. Raleigh. (1906.)
54. Lord Hastings and the Indian States—M. S. Mehta.
55. The Making of India Policy, 1855–65—P. K. Chatterjee.
56. Montagu-Chelmsford Report, 1918.
57. Mountstuart Elphinstone: The Indian Years, 1796–1827—R. D. Choskey.
58. Muslims of Calcutta—M. K. A. Siddiqui.
59. From Naoroji to Nehru: Six Essays in Indian Economic Thought—V. B. Singh. (1975.)
60. Native States of India—Lee-Warner. (1910.)
61. New Constitution of India—G. N. Joshi. (1937.)
62. Notes on Indian Affairs, 2 vols.—F. J. Shore. (1837.)
63. Orissa under the British Crown—J. K. Samal.

64. Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official, 2 vols.—Sir W. H. Sleeman. (1893.)
65. Report of the Butler Committee.
66. Report of the Indian Statutory Commission, Vols. I and II.
67. Report of the Indian Central Committee.
68. Report of the Industrial Commission.
69. Report of the Reforms Enquiry Committee.
70. Reports of the Round Table Conferences.
71. Report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture.
72. Report of the Royal Commission on Labour.
73. Ruin of Indian Trade and Industry—Vamandas Basu.
74. Sketch of the History of India from 1858 to 1918—Dodwell.
75. Society and Politics in Contemporary India—edited by Amar Kumar Mukhopadhyay.
76. Survey of India's Social Life and Economic Condition in the Eighteenth Century (1707–1813)—K. K. Datta. (1961.)
77. Tensions in Bengal Rural Society, 1830–1860—Chittabrata Palit.
78. The Development of Self-Government in India, 1858–1914—Cecil Marne Putnam, Cross.
79. The India of the Queen—W. W. Hunter.
80. The Economic Transition in the Bengal Presidency—H. R. Ghosal. (New edition, 1966.)
81. The Ryotwari System in Madras—Nilmani Mukherjee. (Calcutta, 1962.)
82. Trade and Finance in the Bengal Presidency (1793–1833)—Dr. A. Tripathi. (1956.)
83. Treaties, Engagements, and Sunnuds, 9 vols.—Sir C. Atchison. (1909.)
84. Union and State Relations under the Indian Constitution—M. C. Setalvad.
85. Village Government in India—John Matthai. (1915.)
86. Warren Hastings in Bengal—M. E. Monckton-Jones. (1918.)
87. The White Paper. (1933.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO PORTIONS DEALING WITH INDIAN NATIONALISM IN PART III

1. Allan Octavian Hume—Sir William Wedderburn. (1913.)
2. Autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru.
3. British Paramountcy and Indian Renaissance, Part I—edited by R. C. Majumdar. (Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1963.)
4. The Case that Shook India—Prasant Bhusan.
5. Congress in Evolution—D. Chakrabarty and C. Bhattacharyya.
6. Constitutional Problem in India—Sir Reginald Coupland.
7. Dawn of Renascent India—K. K. Datta. (2nd edition, Allied Publishers Private Limited, 1964.)
8. History of the All-India Kishan Sabha—M. A. Rasul.
9. History of Political Thought in India: Ram Mohan to Dayanand—B. B. Mazumdar. (Published by the University of Calcutta.)
10. History of the Freedom Movement in India—R. C. Majumdar. (Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta, Vol. I, 1962; Vol. II, 1963; Vol. III, 1963.)
11. History of the Indian Nationalist Movement—Sir Verney Lovett. (1919.)
12. How India Wrought Her Freedom—Annie Besant. (1915.)
13. India—Sir Valentine Chirol. (1925.)
14. India a Nation—Annie Besant. (1915.)
15. India Divided—Rajendra Prasad.
16. India in Transition—The Aga Khan. (1918.)
17. India in Transition—Graham Pole.
18. India Struggles for Freedom—Hirendranath Mukerjee.
19. India Today—R. Palme Dutt.
20. India under Experiment—G. M. Chesney. (1918.)
21. India under Ripon—W. S. Blunt. (1909.)
22. Indian Diary—E. S. Montagu. (1930.)
23. Indian National Congress: Its History and Heritage—Dr. Shankar Ghose.
24. Indian National Evolution—A. C. Mazumdar.
25. Indian Political Associations and Reform of Legislature (1818–1917) —B. B. Majumdar. (1965.)
26. Indian Unrest—Sir Valentine Chirol. (1910.)
27. Last Days of Netaji—G. D. Khosla.

28. Life of Lord Curzon—Lord Ronaldshay. (1928.)
29. Making of Modern India—MacNicol. (1924.)
30. Memories of My Life and Time—B. C. Pal. (1932.)
31. Muslims in India—edited by Zafar Iman.
32. My Reminiscences of Sardar Patel, Vols. I & II—V. Shankar.
33. Nation in Making—Sir Surendranath Banerjea. (1925.)
34. Pakistan or The Partition of India—D. R. Ambedkar.
35. The Parsees in India—Eckehard Kulke.
36. Political India, edited by Sir John Cumming. (1932.)
37. Present State of Indian Politics—Sayyid Ahmad Khan. (Allahabad 1888.)
38. Problems and Policies of the British in India, 1885–1898—Hira Lal Singh. (Asia Publishing House, 1963.)
39. Problems of Empire—Britain and India, 1757–1873—O. J. Marshall.
40. Recollections, 2 vols.—Morley. (1917.)
41. Renaissance, Nationalism and Social Changes in Modern India—K.K.Datta. (Bookland Private Limited, Calcutta, 1965.)
42. Renascent India—H. C. E. Zacharias. (1933.)
43. Roots of Separatism in Nineteenth Century Bengal—Amalendu De.
44. Separatism among Indian Muslims, 1860–1923—Francis Robinson.
45. Six Thousand Days: Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister—Amiya Rao and B. G. Rao.
46. Social and Political Ideas of Bepin Chandra Pal—Amalendu Prasad Mookherjee.
47. Some Recent Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah—collected and edited by J. Ahmad.
48. Speeches—G. K. Gokhale. (Madras, 1909.)
49. Speeches of Dr. Rajendra Prasad (January 1950–May 1952), Vol. I.
50. Speeches on Indian Affairs—Morley. (1909.)
51. Subhas Chandra Bose in Self Exile: His Finest Days—S. N. Bhattacharya.
52. The Swadeshi Movement in Bengal—Sunit Sarkar.
53. Truth about the Khilafat—Sayyid Ahmad Khan. (1916.)
54. Writings and Speeches—B. G. Tilak. (1922.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO SECTIONS ON SOCIETY, RELIGION AND CULTURE IN PART III

1. Administration of the East India Company—Sir John Kaye. (1853.)
2. Ahmadiya Movement—H. A. Watter.
3. Assamese, its Formation and Development—B. Kakati.
4. Assamese Literature—B K. Barua. (1941.)
5. Bankim Chandra Chatterjee—S. K. Bose.
6. Bengal Renaissance and William Carey and His Wide—Sunil Kumar Chattopadhya.
7. Bengali Women—Manisa Roy.
8. Biography of a New Faith—P. K. Sen. Volume I (1950.) Volume II (1954.)
9. Brahmo Samaj—Manilal C. Parkeh. (1929.)
10. Carey, Marshman and Ward—J. C. Narsimhan. (1864.)
11. Christianity in India—Sir John Kaye. (1859.)
12. Christianity and the Government of India—A. Mayhew. (1929.)
13. Confessions of a Thug—Meadows Taylor.
14. Education in India, prior to 1854 and 1870–1871—A. Howell. (Calcutta, 1872).
15. Education of India—Arthur Mayhew. (1926.)
16. English Works of Raja Rammohan Ray—edited by J. C. Ghosh, 2 vols. (Calcutta, 1887.)
17. Essays on Indian Idealism —A. K. Coomarswamy.
18. German Scholars on India, Vol. I.
19. Glimpses of Bengal in the Nineteenth Century—R. C. Majumdar.
20. A Guide to Periodicals, Dissertations and Newspapers—Margaret H. Case.
21. Higher Learning in India—edited by Amrik Singh and Philip G. Altback.
22. History of Bengali Language and Literature—D. C. Sen.
23. History of Bengali Literature in the Nineteenth Century—S. K. De. (1919.)
24. History of the Brahmo Samaj—Sivanath Sastri, 2 vols. (Calcutta, (1911.)
25. History of Hindi Literature—F. F. Keay. (1920.)
26. History of the Hindoos—Ward. (1818.)
27. History of Indian Literature, Vol. I—M. Winternitz. (Published by the Calcutta U.P.S. and Longmans, Green, 1927.)

28. History and Prospects of British Education in India—P. W. Thomas. (1891.)
29. History of Protestant Missions in India—M. A. Sherring. (1875.)
30. History of Urdu Literature—Babu Ram Saksena. (1927.)
31. India: Its Administration and Progress—Sir John Strachey.
32. India and Indian Missions—Alexander Duff. (1839.)
33. India under Curzon and after—Lovat Fraser.
34. India—Forty Years of Progress and Reform—R. P. Karkaria. (1896.)
35. Indian Historiography and Rajendra Lal Mitra—K. K. Das Gupta.
36. Indian Renaissance—C. F. Andrews. (1912.)
37. India's Past—A. A. Macdonell. (1927.)
38. India Year by Year, from 1917 to 1934.
39. Indian Islam—Titus. (1930.)
40. Indian Sculpture and Painting—E. B. Havell.
41. Indian Social Reformer, containing Proceedings of the National Social Conferences.
42. Infant Marriage and Enforced Widowhood in India—B. M. Malabari. (Bombay, 1877).
43. Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art.
44. Kanarese Literature—E. P. Rice.
45. Language, Religion and Politics in Northern India—Paul Brass.
46. Last Days in England of Rammohan Ray—Mary Carpenter. (London, 1866. Reprinted by the Rammohan Library, Calcutta, 1915.)
47. Lecture on the Life and Labours of Raja Rammohan Ray (delivered in Boston, U.S.A., 1845.) by William Adam—edited by Rakhaldas Halder. (Calcutta, 1879.)
48. Life of Henry Thomas Colebrooke—Sir T. E. Colebrooke. (1873).
49. Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay—Sir G. O. Trevelyan. (1876).
50. Life of Rammohan Ray (in Bengali)—Nagendranath Chatterjee. (Calcutta, 1881.)
51. Life and Letters of Raja Rammohan Ray—Sophia Dobson Collet. (London, 1900.) Edited by Hemchandra Sarkar with an Introduction. (Calcutta, 1913.)
52. Life of Vidyasagar (in Bengali)—Chandicharan Bandopadhya. (1909.)
53. Literature of Bengal—R. C. Dutta. (1895.)
54. Lord Curzon in India—Sir T. Raleigh. (1906.)
55. Memoirs and Writings of Acharya Bal Shastri Jambhekar (Poona).
56. Memorials of Indian Government—Sir John Kaye. (1853.)
57. Modern India and the Indians—Monier Williams. (1878.)
58. Modern Oriya Literature—Priyaranjan Sen. (Calcutta, 1947.)
59. Modern Vernacular Literature of Hindustan—Grierson.
60. Moral and Material Progress Reports.
61. Mrs. Besant—A Psychological Study—Bipin Chandra Pal. (Madras, 1913.)

62. My Twenty Years in the Cause of Indian Women—Dhondo Keshava Karve. (2nd edition, Poona, 1915.)
63. On the Education of the people of India —C. F. Trevelyan. (1838.)
64. On Rammohan Ray—R. C. Majumdar. (1972.)
65. Plans and Prospects of Social Welfare in India, 1951–61.
66. Policy and Performance in Indian Education, 1947–1974.
67. Raja Rammohan Roy: The Representative Man—Amiya Kumar Sen. (1967.)
68. Rammohan Ray, the Bengali Religious Reformer—Rev. K. S. Mac Donald (Calcutta, 1879.)
69. Rammohan Ray and Modern India—Ramanand Chatterjee. (Calcutta, 1918.)
70. Reform and Regeneration in Bengal—Amitabha Mukherjee.
71. Religious and Social Reform—M. G. Ranade. (Bombay, 1902.)
72. Renascent India—First Phase—R. C. Majumdar.
73. Review of the Growth of Education in British India by the Auxiliary Committee of the Indian Statutory Commission.
74. Samajik Patre Banglar Samaj (in Bengali)—Benoy Ghosh, 4 Parts.
75. Samvad Patre Sekaler Katha (History of Old Days from Bengali Newspapers)—compiled and edited in Bengali by Brajendra Nath Banerji and published by the Bangiya Sahitya Parishad. (1933.)
76. A Social, Cultural and Economic History of India—P. N. Chopra, B. N. Puri and M. N. Das. (1975.)
77. A Social History of Modern India—Kalikinkar Datta. (1975.)
78. Socio-Cultural Background of Modern India—K. K. Datta. (1972.)
79. Social Policy and Social Change in Western India, 1817–1830—Kenneth Ballhatchet.
80. Social Reform in Bengal—Sitanath Tattvabhusan.
81. Speeches and Writings of Sir N. G. Chandavarkar. (Bombay, 1911.)
82. Speeches of Swami Vivekananda.
83. State of Indigenous Education in Bengal and Bihar—Alexander Duff. (Published in Calcutta Review, 1844.)
84. Studies in Tamil Literature and History—V. R . R. Dikshitar. (1930.)
85. " Suttee ", in Calcutta Review, 1867.
86. Telugu Literature—P. Chenchiah and Raja M. B. Rao.
87. The Indian Awakening and Bengal—Nemai Sadhan Bose. (1969.)
88. The Life and Letters of Raja Rammohan Roy—Sophia Dobson Collet. (Latest edition by Dilip Kumar Biswas and Prabhat Chandra Ganguli, 1962.)
89. The Utilitarians and India—Eric Stokes. (1959.)
90. Theory and Practice of Social Service in India—K. M. Munshi.
91. Typical Selections from Oriya Literature, 3 vols.—Edited by B.C. Mazumdar and published by the Calcutta U. P. S. (1925.)

92. Unabinsa Satabdin Bangla (in Bengali)—J. C. Bogal (New edition, 1963.)
93. Unpublished Letters of Vidyasagar—Edited by Amitabha Guha. (1971.)
94. Victoria Yuge Bangala Sahitya—Haranchandra Rakshit.
95. Vidyasagar of Bengali Samaj (in Bengali)—Benoy Ghosh. Parts I–III.
96. Works of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee.
97. Works of Dr. Rabindranath Tagore.

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO APPENDIX III

1. Afghanistan—Frazer Tytler.
2. China, Pakistan and Bangladesh—A. P. Jain. (1974.)
3. China in World Politics: A Study of British Relations, 1974–75—A. P. Jain. (1975.)
4. Foundations of Indo-Soviet Friendship—Nirmala Joshi. (1975.)
5. India, Pakistan and Bangladesh: Search for New Relationship—Dr. Mohammed Ayub.

BIBLIOGRAPHY TO APPENDIX IV

1. Bangladesh Documents—Publications Division, Government of India.
2. Bangladesh. (Published by Vikas, Delhi.)
3. Bangladesh Genocide and World Press—Compiled and edited by Fazlul Quader Quaderi.
4. The Rape of Bangladesh—Anthony Mascarenhas.

LIST OF GOVERNORS-GENERAL

I. Governors-General of Fort William in Bengal
(*Regulating Act of* 1773)

(*Temporary and officiating in italics*)

1774 (October)	Warren Hastings
1785 (February)	*Sir John Macpherson*
1786 (September	Earl (Marquess) Cornwallis
1793 (October)	Sir John Shore (Lord Teignmouth)
1798 (March)	*Sir A. Clarke*
1798 (May)	Earl of Mornington (Marquess Wellesley)
1805 (30th July)	Marquess Cornwallis (for the second time)
1805 (October)	*Sir George Barlow*
1807 (July)	Baron (1st Earl of) Minto (I)
1813 (4th October)	Earl of Moira (Marquess of Hastings)
1823 (January)	*John Adam*
1823 (1st August)	Baron (Earl) Amherst
1828 (March)	*William Butterworth Bayley*
1828 (4th July)	Lord William Cavendish-Bentinck

II. Governors-General of India
(*Charter Act of* 1833)

1833	Lord William Cavendish-Bentinck
1835 (20th March)	*Sir Charles (Lord) Metcalfe*
1836 (March)	Baron (Earl of) Auckland
1842 (February)	Baron (Earl of) Ellenborough
1844 (June)	*William Wilberforce Bird*
1844 (July)	Sir Henry (Viscount) Hardinge
1848 (January)	Earl (Marquess) of Dalhousie
1856 (February)	Viscount (Earl) Canning

III. Governors-General and Viceroy

1858 (1st November)	Viscount (Earl) Canning

1862 (March)	8th Earl of Elgin (I)
1863	*Sir Robert Napier* (*Baron Napier of Magdala*)
1863	*Sir William T. Denison*
1864 (January)	Sir John (Lord) Lawrence
1869 (January)	Earl of Mayo
1872	*Sir John Strachey*
1872	*Lord Napier of Merchistoun*
1872 (May)	Baron (Earl of) Northbrook
1876 (April)	Baron (1st Earl of) Lytton (I)
1880 (June)	Marquess of Ripon
1884 (December)	Earl of Dufferin (Marquess of Dufferin and Ava)
1888 (December)	Marquess of Lansdowne
1894 (January)	9th Earl of Elgin (II)
1899 (6th January)	Baron (Marquess) Curzon of Kedleston
1904 (April)	*Lord Ampthill*
1904 (December)	Baron (Marquess) Curzon of Kedleston (re-appointed)
1905 (November)	4th Earl of Minto (II)
1910 (November)	Baron Hardinge of Penshurst (II)
1916 (April)	Baron Chelmsford
1921 (April)	Earl of Reading
1925	*2nd Earl of Lytton* (II)
1926 (April)	Lord Irwin
1929	*Lord Goschen* (during the absence of Lord Irwin on leave)
1931 (April)	Earl of Willingdon
1934 (May–August)	*Sir George Stanley* (Offg.)
1934	Earl of Willingdon
1936 (18th April)	Marquess of Linlithgow

IV. Governors-General and Crown Representatives
(*Act of* 1935)

1937 (31st March)	Marquess of Linlithgow
1938 (June–October)	*Baron Brabourne* (Offg.)
1938	Marquess of Linlithgow
1943	Viscount (Earl) Wavell
1945	*Sir John Colville* (Offg.)
1947 (March–August)	Viscount (Earl) Mountbatten (last Viceroy of United India, First Governor-General of the Indian Dominion, 1947–1948)

V. Governors-General
(*Indian Independence Act*)

Indian Union

1947	Earl Mountbatten
(November)	*Śrī Chakravarti Rājagopālāchāri* (Offg.)
1948 (June)	Śri Chakravarti Rajagopalachari

Pakistān

1947	Qaid-i-Azam M. A. Jinnah
1948 (September)	Khawaja Nazimuddin
1951	Ghulam Mohammad
1955	Major-General Iskander Mirza

LIST OF PRIME MINISTERS AND PRESIDENTS SINCE 1947

Prime Ministers

Indian Union

1947	Jawaharlāl Nehru
1964	Lal Bahadur Shastri
1966	Mrs. Indira Gandhi
1977	Morarji Desai

Pakistān

1947	Liāquat ʻĀlī Khān
1951	Khawaja Nazimuddin
1952	Ghulam Mohammad
1952	Khawaja Nazimuddin
1953	Mohammed Ali
1956	Hussain Suhrawardy
1958	Malik Feroz Khan Noon
1958	Field-Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan
1973	Zulfiquar Ali Bhutto
1977	General Mohammad Zia-ul Haq (Chief Martial Law Administrator)

Bangladesh

1971	Tajuddin Ahmed
1972	Sheikh Mujibur Rehman
1975	Mansoor Ali
1975	No Prime Minister

Presidents

Indian Union

1950	Dr. Rājendra Prasād
1962	Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan
1967	Dr. Zakir Hussain
1972	V. V. Giri
1975	Fakhruddin Ali Ahmad
1977	Sanjiva Reddy

Pakistān

1956	Major-General Iskander Mirza
1958	Field-Marshal Mohammed Ayub Khan
1969	General Yahya Khan
1971	Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto
1973	Fazal Ilahi Chowdhury

Bangladesh

1971	Sheikh Mujibur Rehman
1972	Abu Syed Chowdhary
1975	Mohumudulla
1975	Sheikh Mujibur Rehman
1975	Khondokar Mostak Ahmed
1975	Abu Saddat Mohammad Sayem
1976	Major-General Zia-ur Rahman (Chief Martial Law Administrator)

CHRONOLOGY

B.C.

3102. Epoch of the Kali Yuga Era and of the Bhārata War according to one school of astronomers.

c. 2700. Date of Indus Valley Seals found at Kish.

2449. Date of heroes of the Bhārata War according to a second group of astronomers and chronologists.

c. 1435. Aryan Kings in Western Asia.

c. 1414. Date of the Bhārata War according to certain Purāṇas.

c. 1375. Worship of Aryan deities in the land of the Mitanni.

817. Traditional date of the birth of Pārśvanātha.

558. Accession of Cyrus the Great, conqueror of Kāpiśi.

544. Traditional Epoch of the Ceylonese Era of Buddha's Nirvāṇa.

527. Traditional Epoch of the Era of Mahāvīra's Nirvāṇa.

522. Accession of Darius I, conqueror of the "Indian" satrapy of the Persian Empire.

c. 518–517. Naval Expedition of Skylax and conquest of the Indian satrapy.

486. Cantonese date of Buddha's Nirvāṇa.

327–326. Invasion of India by Alexander.

325. Alexander leaves India.

c. 324. Rise of the Maurya Dynasty.

313. Jaina date of the year of Chandragupta's accession, probably as ruler of Avanti.

c. 305. Indian Expedition of Seleukos Nikator.

c. 273–232. The reign of Aśoka.

c. 206. Indian Expedition of Antiochos III, King of Syria.

c. 187. Rise of the Dynasty of Pushyamitra.

165. Plato, King of Bactria.

162. Latest possible date for the assumption of the title "Great" by Eukratides, King of Bactria and the Indian borderland.

c. 145–101. Elāra Chola, King of Ceylon.

138– 88. Conflict of the kings of Parthia with Sakas in Eastern Irān.

c. 126. The Chinese ambassador Chang-Kien visits the Yueh-chi in the Oxus region.

58. Epoch of the Kṛita–Malava–Vikrama Era.

57–38. Squared letters appear on Parthian coins.
c. 44–29. Tamil kings in Ceylon.
c. 30. End of Śuṅga-Kāṇva rule in Eastern Malwa. Sātavāhana supremacy in the Deccan.
c. 26–20. Indian embassies to Augustus.
2. A Chinese official instructed in Buddhism by a Yueh-chi King.

A.D.

c. 1. Isidore of Charax.
c. 47. Takht-i-Bāhi record of Gondophernes.
c. 64. The Chinese Emperor Ming-ti sends for Buddhist texts.
77. Pliny's Natural History.
78. Epoch of the Śaka Era.
Decline of the Parthian and the consolidation of the Kushān power in the Indus valley.
89–105. Kushān King repulsed by the Chinese General Pan Chao.
c. 100. Indian embassy to the Roman Emperor Trajan.
119–124. Nahapāna.
His power overthrown by Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi.
130–150. Rudradāman I, contemporary of Vāsishṭhīputra Śrī Śātakarṇi.
148–170. An-Shih-Kao translates a work by Kanishka's chaplain.
c. 152. China loses Khotān.
c. 200. Palmyra created a Roman colony.
230. The Yueh chi King Po-tiao (Vāsudeva?) sends an embassy to China.
248. Epoch of the Traikuṭaka-Kalachuri Era.
276–293. Sassanian conquest of parts of North-West India.
320. (Feb. 26) Gupta Era begins.
c. 360. Ceylonese Embassy to Samudra Gupta.
c. 380. Accession of Chandra Gupta II.
388. Latest known date of the Śakas of Western India.
405–411. Travels of Fa-Hien in the Gupta Empire.
c. 415. Accession of Kumāra Gupta I.
436. Siṁhavarman, the Pallava King of Kāñchī, mentioned in the Lokavibhāga.
c. 448. Huns in the Oxus valley.
455. Accession of Skanda Gupta.
458. Date of the Lokavibhāga.
467. Latest known date of Skanda Gupta.
473. Kumara Gupta II.
476. Birth of the astronomer Āryabhaṭa.
c. 477–495. Reign of Budha Gupta.

507–508. Vainya Gupta.
Gopachandra, a contemporary of Vainya Gupta.
510–511. Bhānu Gupta.
533. Yaśodharman, conqueror of Mihirakula the Hun King.
543–544. Continuance of Gupta rule in North Bengal. Rise of the Chalukyas of Vātāpi.
547. Kosmas Indikopleustes.
554. Iśānavarman Maukhari.
566–567. Accession of Kīrtivarman I, Chalukya.
606. Accession of Harshavardhana.
609. Coronation of Pulakeśin II, Chalukya.
619–620. Supremacy of Śaśāṅka in Eastern India.
622. Era of the Hijra.
634. Reference to the fame of Kālidāsa and Bhāravi in the Aihole inscription.
637. Arab raid against Thānā.
639. Foundation of Lhāsā by Srong-tsan-Gampo.
641. Harsha's embassy to China.
c. 642. Death of Pulakeśin II.
Probable date of the death of Aṁśuvarman of Nepāl.
c. 642–668. Narasiṁhavarman I, the Great Pallava.
643. Harsha's meeting with Hiuen-Tsang.
First mission of Wang-Hiuen-T'se.
646. Second mission of Wang-Hiuen-T'se.
Śilāditya (of Mewar?)
c. 646–647. Death of Harsha.
c. 647–648. Bhāskaravarman or Kumārarāja, King of Kāmarupa, helped Wang-Hiuen-T'se.
657. Third mission of Wang-Hiuen-T'se.
661. Guhila Aparājita.
667. " Five Indies " send ambassadors to China.
672–673. Ādityasena.
674. Vikramāditya I, Chalukya.
Parameśvaravarman I, Pallava.
675–685. Itsing at Nālandā.
711. Invasion of Sind by Muhammad b. Qāsim.
712. Arab conquest of Nīrūn and Aror.
Defeat and death of Dāhir.
713. Capture of Multān by the Muslims.
720. Śri Narasimha Potavarman's diplomatic relations with China.
724–743. Khalif Hishām.
Junaid, Governor of Sind.
731. Yaśovarman's embassy to China.

733. Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa receives investiture as king from the Emperor of China.
742. Dantidurga a feudatory of the Chalukyas.
743–789. Sāntarakshita and Padmasambhava invited to Tibet. Rise of Lamaism.
753. Rise of the Rāshtrakūṭa Empire.
783. Indrāyudha (Kanauj).
Vatsarāja (Pratihāra.)
793–815. Govinda III, Rāshtrakūṭa.
815. Nāgabhaṭa (Pratihāra.)
815–877. Amoghavarsha I, Rāshṭrakūṭa.
829. Harjara, King of Kāmarūpa
c. 836. Accession of Bhoja I, King of Kanauj.
c. 850. Lalliya Shāhi.
855. Accession of Avantivarman of Kāshmīr.
c. 871–907. Āditya I, Chola.
879. New Nepalese Era.
892. Coronation of Bhima I, Eastern Chālukya.
393. Mahendrapāla I (Pratihāra.)
907. Accession of Parāntaka I, Chola.
914. Mahīpāla I (Pratihāra.)
Continuance of Pratihāra rule in Surāshṭra.
939. Yaśaskara, King of Kāshmīr.
942–943. Guhila Bhatripaṭṭa II.
945. Coronation of Amma II (Vijayāditya VI), Eastern Chalukya.
c. 950–1003. Queen Diddā of Kāshmīr.
c. 954–1002. Dhaṅga Chandella.
c. 962. Foundation of the Kingdom of Ghazni.
973. Foundation of the later Chalukya Empire (of Kalyāna).
c. 974–995. Muñja.
977. Accession of Sabuktigīn.
985. Accession of Rājarāja Great, Chola.
986–987. First invasion of Sabuktigīn.
c. 995. Accession of Sindhurāja Navasāhasāṅka.
997. Death of Sabuktigīn.
998. Accession of Sultān Mahmūd.
1001. Great defeat of Jaipāl by Sultān Mahmūd.
1008. Battle near Und.
1012–1044. Rājendra Chola I.
1013. Mahmūd captures Nandānā.
1018. Rājyapāla (Pratihāra).
Kanauj seized by Mahmūd of Ghazni.
c. 1018–1055. Bhoja of Dhārā.

1026. Sārnāth inscription of the time of Māhipāla I of Bengal.
Fall of Nidar Bhim (Shāhi).
Sack of Somnāth (during the reign of Bhimdeva I).
1030. Death of Sultānā Mahmūd.
1032. Vimala Sha.
1039. Death of Gāngeyadeva Kalachuri.
c. 1040. Coronation of Lakshmi-karṇa of the Kalachuri Dynasty.
1052. Red Fort at Delhi.
1070–1122. Rājendra Chola, Kulottunga I.
1076–1127. Vikramāditya VI of Kalyāna.
c. 1076–1148. Anantavarman Choḍa Gaṅga.
1089–1101. Harsha of Kāshmīr.
1090. Rise of the Gāhaḍavālas.
c. 1098. Kīrtivarman Chandella.
c. 1106–1141. Vishṇuvarthana Hoysala.
1113–1114. Foundation of an Era by Siddharāja Jayasimha of Gujarāt.
1114–1154. Govinda Chandra, the Great Gāhaḍavāla King.
1119. Epoch of the Lakshmaṇa Sena Era.
c. 1143–1172. Kumārapāla of Gujarāt.
1153–1164. Vigraharāja IV (Vīsaladeva).
1158. Ballāla Sena.
c. 1167–1202. Paramardi Chandella.
1170–1194. Jayachchandra.
1175. Muhammad bin Sām invades India and captures Multān.
1178. Mūhammad defeated in Gujarāt.
1179–1242. Bhīmdev II of Gujarāt.
c. 1185–1205. Lakshmaṇā Sena of Bengal.
1186. Fall of the Yamīnī Dynasty.
1191. First battle of Tarāin.
1192. Second battle of Tarāin.
Fall of Prithvīrāja III Chāhamāna (Chauhān).
1192–1193. Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak takes Delhi.
1194. Battle of Chandwār. Fall of the Gāhaḍavālas.
1197–1247. Singhana the Great, Yādava King.
c. 1200. Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn conquers parts of Eastern India.
1206. Death of Muhammad bin Sām and accession of Qutb-ud-dīn in India.
1210. Death of Qutb-ud-dīn.
Accession of Ārām Shāh.
1210–1211. Accession of Iltutmish.
1221. Invasion of the Mongols under Chengiz Khān.
1228. Ahoms in Assam.
1231. Tejahpāla.
1231–1232. Foundation of the Qutb Minār.

1236. Death of Iltutmish.
Accession and deposition of Fīrūz.
Accession of Raziyya.
1240. Deposition and murder of Raziyya.
Accession of Mu'iz-ud-din Bahrām.
1241. Capture of Lahore by the Mongols.
c. 1244–1262. Vīsaladeva, King of Gujarāt.
1246. Deposition and death of Ma'sūd.
Accession of Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd.
1251–1270. Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I.
1260–1291. Rudrammā, the Great Kākatyīa Queen.
1266. Death of Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd.
Accession of Ghiyās-ud-dīn Balban.
1279. Latest known date of Rājendra IV Chola.
Rebellion of Tughril in Bengal.
1280. Bughrā Khān appointed to the Government of Bengal.
1287. Death of Balban.
Accession of Mu'iz-ud-dīn Kaiqubād.
Mongol invasion repelled.
1288. Marco Polo at Kayal.
1290. Death of Kaiqubād.
Accession of Jalāl-ud-dīn Firūz Khaljī.
1292. 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī captures Bhīlsa.
Mongol invasion.
1294. Devagiri pillaged by 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī.
1296. Accession of 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī.
1297. Conquest of Gujarāt (from Karnadeva II).
1301. Capture of Ranthambhor by 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī.
1302–1303. Capture of Chitor.
Mongol invasion.
1305. Conquest of Mālwa, Ujjain, Māṇḍū, Dhār and Chanderī by the Khaljīs.
1306–1307. Kāfūr's expedition to Devagiri.
1308. Expedition to Warangal.
1310. Malik Nāib's expedition into the South Indian Peninsula.
1316. Death of 'Alā-ud-dīn.
Accession of Shihāb-ud-dīn 'Umar.
Death of Malik Nāib.
Deposition of 'Umar and accession of Qutb-ud-dīn Mubārak.
1317–1318. Extinction of the Yādava Dynasty.
1320. Usurpation of Nāsir-ud-dīn Khusrav.
His overthrow by Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq.
1321. Expedition to Warangal under Muhammad Jauna (Ulugh Khān).

Rebellion of Muhammad.
1323. Second expedition to Warangal under Muhammad.
Mongol invasion.
1325. Accession of Muhammad bin Tughluq.
1326–1327. Rebellion of Gurshāsp.
1327. Destruction of Kampilī.
Transference of the capital form Delhi to Daulatābād.
1328. The Mongols invade India.
1329. Qarachil expedition. Issue of forced currency of brass and copper for silver.
1333–1334. Arrival of Ibn Batūtah.
1334. Rebellion in Madurā.
Capture of Anegundī by Muhammad bin Tughluq.
1336. Traditional date of the foundation of Vijayanagar.
1337–1338. Expedition to Nagarkot.
1338–1339. Independent Sultānate in Bengal.
1339. Shāh Mīr, King of Kāshmīr.
1342. Ibn Batūtah leaves Delhi on his mission to China.
1345. Accession of Shams-ud-dīn Iliyās in Bengal.
1347. 'Alā-ud-dīn Bahman Shāh proclaimed King of the Deccan.
1351. Death of Muhammad bin Tughluq.
Accession of Fīrūz, son of Rajab.
1353. Fīrūz's first expedition to Bengal.
1359. Fīrūz's second expedition to Bengal.
1360. Fīrūz's expedition to Orissa.
1361. Capture of Nagarkot or Kāngra by Fīrūz.
1363. Fīrūz's first expedition to Sind.
1374. Bukka sends an embassy to the Emperor of China.
1377. Extinction of the Sultānate of Madurā.
1382. Rebellion of Rājā Ahmad or Malik Rājā in Khāndesh.
1388. Death of Fīrūz, son of Rajab.
Accession of Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq II.
1389. Death of Tughluq II.
1392. Dilāwār Khān, Governor of Mālwa.
1393. Independent Sultānate of Jaunpur.
1398. Invasion of Timūr.
1414. Khizr Khān occupied Delhi.
Rājā Ganesh in Bengal.
1417–1418. Coins of Danujamardana.
1420. Nicolo Conti visits Vijayanagar.
1424. Capture of Warangal by Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī.
1429. Transfer of the Bahmanī capital from Gulbarga to Bīdar.
c. 1430–1469. Rānā Kumbha.
1434–1435. Kapilendra, King of Orissa.

1443. 'Abdur Razzāk comes to India.
1451. Bahlūl Lodī ascends the throne of Delhi.
1458–1511. Mahmūd Begarha.
1459. Foundation of Jodhpur.
1469. Birth of Guru Nānak.
1470. Death of Zain-ul-'Ābidīn.
1472. Birth of Farid (Sher Khān).
1481. Murder of Mahmūd Gāwān.
1484. Independence of Berar.
1486. Abyssinian rule in Bengal.
1486–1487. Fall of the Sangama Dynasty of Vijayanagar.
Beginning of the rule of the Sāluva Dynasty.
1489. Accession of Sikandar Lodī.
1489–1490. Foundation of the 'Ādil Shāhī Dynasty of Bijāpur.
1490. Establishment of the independent Nizām Shāhī Dynasty of Ahmadnagar.
1493. Husain Shāh elected King of Bengal.
1494. Accession of Bābur in Farghāna.
1497–1498. First voyage of Vasco da Gama.
1504. Bābur occupies Kābul.
1505. Beginning of the rule of the Tuluva Dynasty in Vijayanagar.
1509. Albuquerque, Portuguese Governor of India.
Accession of Kṛishṇadeva Rāya.
c. 1509–1527. Rānā Sanga.
1510. The Portugese capture Goa.
1511. Bābar captures Samarqānd again.
1512–1518. Independence of the Kutb Shāhī Dynasty of Golkundā.
1513. Death of Albuquerque.
1517. Death of Sikandar Lodī.
Accession of Ibrāhīm Lodī.
1526. First battle of Pānīpat.
1527. Battle of Khānua.
1529. Battle of Gogrā.
1529–1530. Death of Kṛishṇadeva Rāya.
1530. Death of Bābur and accession of Humāyūn.
1533. Bahādur of Gujarāt captures Chitor.
1534. Humāyūn marches to Mālwa.
1535. Defeat of Bahādur Shah of Gujarāt and his flight to Māndū.
1537. Death of Bahādur Shāh of Gujarat.
1538. Sher Khān defeats Mahmūd Shāh of Bengāl.
Humāyūn enters Gaur.
Death of Guru Nānak
1539. Sher Khān defeats Humāyūn at Chaunsa and assumes sovereignty.

1540. Humāyūn's defeat near Kanauj.
1542. Birth of Akbar.
1544. Humāyūn arrives in Persia.
1545. Death of Sher Shāh.
Accession of Islām Shāh.
1552. Death of Guru Angad.
1554. Death of Islām Shāh.
Accession of Muhammad 'Ādil Shāh.
Sikandar Sūr in the Punjāb.
1555. Humāyūn recovers the throne of Delhi.
1556. Death of Humāyūn and accession of Akbar.
Second battle of Pānīpat.
1558. Death of Ibrāhīm Sūr. End of the Sūr Dynasty.
1560. Fall of Bairam Khān.
1561. Mughul invasion of Mālwa.
1562. Akbar marries a princess of Amber.
End of Petticoat Government.
1564. Abolition of the *Jizya*.
Death of Rāṇī Durgāvatī and annexation of the Gond kingdom.
1565. Battle of Talikota.
1568. Kararānī's conquest of Orissa.
Fall of Chitor.
1569. Capture of Ranthambhor and Kālinjar.
Birth of Salīm.
1571. Foundation of Fathpur Sīkrī.
1572. Akbar annexes Gujarāt.
1573. Surāt surrenders to Akbar.
Understanding with the Portuguese.
1574. Death of Guru Amardās.
1575. Battle of Tukaroi.
1576. Subjugation of Bengal.
Death of Dāūd near Rājmahal.
The battle of Gogundā or Haldighāt.
1577. Akbar's troops invade Khāndesh.
1579. " Infallibility Decree " promulgated.
1580. Accession of Ibrāhīm 'Ādīl Shāh II in Bijāpur.
First Jesuit mission at Agra.
Rebellion in Bihār and Bengal.
1581. Akbar's march against Muhammad Hakīm and reconciliation with him.
Death of Guru Rāmdās.
1582. Divine Faith promulgated.
1585. Fitch at Āgra.

1586. Annexation of Kāshmīr.
1589. Death of Todar Mal and Bhagwān Dās.
1591. Mughul conquest of Sind.
1592. Annexation of Orissa.
1595. Siege of Ahmadnagar.
Acquisition of Quandahār.
Annexation of Baluchistān.
Death of Faizī.
1597. Death of Rānā Pratāp.
1600. Charter to the London East India Company.
Ahmadnagar stormed.
1601. Capture of Asirgarh.
1602. Death of Abul Fazl. Formation of the United East India Company of the Netherlands.
1605. Death of Akbar and accession of Jahāngīr.
1606. Rebellion of Khusrav.
Qandahār invested by the Persians.
Execution of the Fifth Sikh Guru, Arjan.
1607. Qandahār relieved by the Mughuls.
Sher Afghān, first husband of Nūr Jahān, killed.
1607. Second revolt of Khusrav.
1608. Malik 'Ambar takes Ahmadnagar.
1609. Hawkins arrives at Āgra.
The Dutch open a factory at Pulicat.
1611. Jahāngīr marries Nūr Jahān.
Hawkins leaves Āgra. The English establish a factory at Masulipatam.
1612. Khurram marries Mumtāz Mahal.
First English factory at Surāt.
The Mughul Governor of Bengal defeats the rebellious Afghāns.
Mughuls annex Kuch Hājo.
1613. Jahāngīr's *firman* to the English Company.
1615. Submission of Mewār to the Mughuls.
Arrival of Sir Thomas Roe in India.
1616. Roe received by Jahāngīr.
The Dutch establish a factory at Surāt.
1618. Roe, after obtaining *firmans* for English trade, leaves the Imperial Court.
1619. Roe leaves India.
1620. Capture of the Kāngra fort.
Shahryār betrothed to Nūr Jahān's daughter (by Sher Afghān).
Malik 'Ambar revolts in the Deccan.

1622. Death of Khusrav, Shāh 'Abbās of Persia besieges and takes Qandahār. Shāh Jahān ordered to recover Qandahār but rebels. Malik 'Ambar takes Bīdar.
1624. Suppression of Shāh Jahān's rebellion.
1625. Dutch Factory at Chinsurā.
1626. Death of Malik 'Ambar.
Rebellion of Mahābat Khān.
1627. Death of Jahāngīr.
Birth of Shivājī (or 1630 according to some).
1628. Shāh Jahān proclaimed Emperor.
1629. Rebellion of Khān Jahān Lodī.
1631. Death of Mumtāz Mahal.
Defeat and death of Khān Jahān Lodī.
1632. Mughul invasion of Bijāpur.
Sack of Hugli.
Grant of the "*Golden Firman*" to the English Company by the Sultān of Golkundā.
1633. End of Ahmadnagar Dynasty.
1634. *Firman* permitting English trade in Bengal.
1636. Treaties with Bijāpur and Golkunda.
Shāhjī enters the service of Bijāpur.
Aurangzeb appointed Viceroy of the Deccan.
1638. Peace between the Mughuls and the Āhoms.
Qandahār recovered by the Mughuls.
1639. Foundation of Fort St. George at Madras.
1646. Shivāji captures Torna.
1649. Persians recover Qandahār.
1651. English factory started at Hugli.
Firman granted to the English Company by Shujā.
1653. Aurangzeb reappointed Viceroy of the Deccan.
The Dutch start a factory at Chinsurā.
1656. The Mughuls attack Hyderābād and Golkundā. Peace with Golkundā. Annexation of Jāvli by Shivājī. Death of Muhammad 'Ādil Shāh of Bijāpur. Another *firman* granted to the English by Shujā.
1657. Shivājī raids Ahmadnagar and Junnar but is pardoned.
Invasion of Bijāpur by Aurangzeb.
Aurangzeb captures Bīdar and Kalyānī.
Illness of Shāh Jāhān.
The war of succession begins.
1658. Battles of Dharmāt and Samūgarh.
Coronation of Aurangzeb.
1659. Battles of Khajwah and Deorāi.
Execution of Dārā. Captivity of Murād and Shāh Jahān.

Second coronation of Aurangzeb.
Murder of Afzal Khān.

1660. Shujā chased from Bengal to Arākān. Mīr Jumla appointed Governor of Bengal.

1661. Cession of Bombay to the English.
Execution of Murād. Mughul capture of Cooch Bihār.

1662. Peace with Āhoms.
Death of Sulaimān Shukoh.

1663. Death of Mīr Jumla.
Shāista Khān appointed Governor of Bengal.

1664. Shivājī sacks Surāt.
Colbert, the French Minister, founds an India Company.

1664. Shivājī assumes royal title.

1666. Death of Shāh Jahān.
Capture of Chittāgong.
Shivājī's visit to Āgra and escape.

1667. The Yūsufzāīs rebel.

1668. New religious ordinances.
Cession of Bombay to the East India Company.
First French factory started at Surāt.

1669. Jāt rebellion under Gokla.

1670. Second sack of Surāt.

1671. Rise of Chhatrasāl Bundelā.

1672. Satnāmī outbreak.
Revolt of the Afrīdīs.
Shāistā Khān's *firman* to the English Company.

1674. François Martin founds Pondicherry.
Shivājī assumes the title of Chhatrapati.

1675. Execution of Teg Bahādur, Guru of the Sikhs.

1677. Shivājī's conquests in the Carnatic.

1678. Mārwār occupied by the Mughuls.
Death of Jaswant Singh.

1679. Reimposition of the *Jizya*.
Mughul attack on Mārwār.

1680. Death of Shivājī.
Rebellion of Prince Akbar.
Aurangzeb's *firman* to the English Company.

1681. Loss of Kāmarūpa by the Mughuls.
Aurangzeb goes to the Deccan.

1686. English war with the Mughuls.
Fall of Bijāpur.

1687. Fall of Golkundā.

1689. Execution of Sambhājī. Rajaram succeeds but retires to Jinjī.

1690. Peace between the Mughuls and the English.
Calcutta founded.
1691. Defeat of the Jāts. Aurangzeb at the zenith of his power.
Grant of a *firman* by Ibrāhīm Khān to the English.
1692. Renewed Maratha activity in the Deccan.
1698. The new English Company Trading to the East Indies.
The English obtain zamindārī of Sutanaṭi, Calcutta and Govindapur.
1699. First Marātha raid on Mālwa.
1700. Death of Rājārām and regency of his widow Tārā Bai.
1702. Amalgamation of the English and the London East India Companies.
1703. The Marāthas enter Berar.
1706. The Marāthas raid Gujarāt and sack Baroda.
1707. Death of Aurangzeb.
Battle of Jajau.
Accession of Bahādur Shāh.
1708. Shāhu, King of the Marāthas.
Death of Guru Govind Singh.
1712. Death of Bahādur Shāh.
Accession of Jahāndār Shah.
1713. Farrukhsiyar becomes Emperor.
Jahāndār Shāh murdered.
1714. Bālāji Viswanāth Peshwā. Husain 'Ālī appointed Viceroy of the Deccan.
The treaty of the Marāthas with Husain 'Āli.
1716. Execution of Bāndā, the Sikh leader. The Surman Embassy.
1717. Farrukhsiyar's *firman* to the English Company.
Reimposition of *Jizya*.
1719. Husain 'Ālī returns to Delhi with the Marāthas.
Farrukhsiyar put to death.
Death of Rafi-ud-Darajāt.
Accession of Muhammad Shāh.
1720. Accession of Bāji Rāo Peshwā.
Fall of the Sayyid brothers.
1724. Sa'ādat Khān appointed Governor of Oudh.
Nizām virtually independent in the Deccan.
Qamār-ud-dīn becomes *wazīr*.
1725–1739. Shujā-ud-dīn, Governor of Bengal.
1735. Bāji Rāo recognized by the Imperial Government as ruler of Malwa.
1739. Nādir Shāh takes Delhi.
Death of Shujā-ud-dīn and accession of Sarfarāz in Bengal.

The Marāthas capture Salsette and Bassein.
1740. 'Ālīvardī Khān becomes Governor of Bengal.
Accession of Bālāji Rāo Peshwā.
The Marāthas invade Arcot.
Dost 'Āli killed.
1742. Marātha invasion of Bengal.
Dupleix Governor of Pondicherry.
Murder of Safdar 'Āli, Nawāb of the Carnatic.
1744–1748. First Anglo-French War.
1745. Rise of the Rohillas.
1746. La Bourdonnais takes Madras.
1747. Invasion of Ahmad Shāh Abdālī.
1748. Death of Nizām-ul-mulk.
Death of Muhammad Shāh of Delhi and accession of Ahmad Shāh.
1749. Death of Shāhu.
Madras restored to the British.
1750. Defeat and death of Nāsir Jang.
1750–1754. War of the Deccan and Carnatic succession.
1751. Clive's defence of Arcot.
Death of Muzaffar Jang and accession of Salābat Jang.
Treaty of 'Ālīvardī with the Marāthas.
1754. Recall of Dupleix. Godeheu's treaty with the English.
Accession of 'Ālamgīr II.
1756. Death of 'Ālīvardī Khān.
Accession of Sirāj-ud-daulah.
1756–1763. Seven Years' War.
1756. Sirāj-ud-daulah captures Calcutta.
1757. Sack of Delhi and Mathura by Ahmad Shāh Abbālī.
The English capture Chandernagore.
Battle of Plassey.
Mīr Jāfar made Nawāb of Bengal.
1758. Lally in India. The Marāthas in the Punjab.
Capture of Masulipatam by Forde.
1759. Forde defeats the Dutch at Bedārā.
'Alī Gauhar invades Bihār.
Murder of 'Ālamgīr II by Ghāzi-ud-dīn.
1760. Battle of Wandiwāsh.
Battle of Udgīr.
Mīr Qāsim, Nawāb of Bengal.
Vansittart, Company's Governor in Bengal.
1761. Third battle of Pānīpat.
Fall of Pondicherry.
Shāh 'Ālam II becomes Emperor.

Shujā-ud-daulah becomes *waẓīr*.
Accession of Mādhava Rāo Peshwā.
Rise of Hyder 'Ali.
1763. Expulsion of Mīr Kāsīm.
1764. Battle of Buxār.
1765. Death of Mīr Jāfar.
Grant of the *Diwāni* of Bengal, Bihār and Orissa to the British.
Treaty of Allāhābād.
Clive, Company's Governor in Bengal.
1766. Grant of the Northern Sarkārs to the English.
1767. Departure of Clive. Verelst, Company's Governor in Bengal.
1767–1769. The First Mysore War.
1770. The Great Bengal Famine.
1772. Warren Hastings' appointment as Governor.
Death of Mādhava Rāo Peshwā.
1773. The Regulating Act.
1774. The Rohilla (Ruhela) War.
Warren Hastings becomes Governor-General.
Establishment of Supreme Court, Calcutta.
1775. Trial and execution of Nanda Kumār.
1775–1782. The First Anglo-Marātha War.
1776. The Treaty of Purandhar.
1779. Convention of Wadgāon.
1780. Popham's capture of Gwālior.
1780–1784. Second Mysore War.
1781. Deposition of Chait Singh.
Act passed to amend the Regulating Act.
1782. Affair of the Begams of Oudh.
The Treaty of Salbai.
Death of Hyder 'Alī.
1783. Death of Coote.
Fox's India Bills.
1784. Treaty of Mangalore.
Pitt's India Act.
1785. Resignation of Warren Hastings.
1786. Lord Cornwallis becomes Governor-General.
1790–1792. Third Mysore War.
1792. Treaty of Seringapatam.
1792. Ranjit Singh succeeds his father as leader of a Sikh Misl.
1793. The Permanent Settlement of Bengal.
Renewal of the Company's Charter.
1794. Death of Mahādājī Sindhia.
1795. The Battle of Kharda.

Death of Ahalyā Bāī.
1797. Zamān Shāh at Lahore.
Death of Asaf-ud-daulah of Oudh.
1798. Wāzīr 'Ālī deposed and succeeded by Sa'ādat 'Ālī.
Lord Mornington (Wellesley) becomes Governor-General.
Subsidiary Treaty with the Nizām.
1799. Fourth Mysore War.
Death of Tipu. Partition of Mysore.
Ranjit Singh's appointment to the Governorship of Lahore.
Malcolm's mission to Persia.
William Carey opens Baptist Mission at Serampore.
1800. Death of Nānā Fadnavis.
Establishment of the College of Fort William.
1801. Annexation of the Carnatic.
1802. Treaty of Bassein.
1803–1805. The Second Anglo-Marātha War.
1805. Siege of Bharatpur fails. Recall of Wellesley.
1806. Vellore Mutiny.
1808. Mission of Malcolm to Persia and of Elphinstone to Kābul.
1809. Treaty of Amritsar.
1813. Renewal of the Company's Charter.
1814–1816. The Anglo-Gurkhā War.
1817–1818. The Pindarī War.
1817–1819. The Last Anglo-Marātha War.
1819. Elphinstone, Governor of Bombay.
1820. Munro, Governor of Madras.
The Samāchār Darpan started.
1824–1826. The First Burmese War.
1826. Fall of Bharatpur.
1827. Death of Sir Thomas Munro.
Malcolm, Governor of Bombay.
1828. Lord William Bentinck becomes Governor-General.
1829. Prohibition of Satī.
1829–1837. Suppression of Thuggee.
1830. Rāmmohan Roy visits England.
1831. Rājā of Mysore deposed and its administration taken over by the Company.
Burnes' journey up the Indus.
Meeting of Ranjit and the Governor-General at Rupar.
1832. Annexation of Jaintiā.
1833. Renewal of the Company's Charter.
Abolition of the Company's trading rights.
Legislative power centralized.
1834. Annexation of Coorg.

Macaulay Law Member.
Formation of the Āgra Province.
1835. Education Resolution.
Metcalfe and abolition of Press restrictions.
1838. Tripartite Treaty between Shāh Shujā, Ranjit Singh and the English.
1839. Death of Ranjit Singh.
New treaty forced on the Amīrs of Sind.
1839–1842. The First Afghān War.
1843. Conquest of Sind.
Gwālior War.
Suppression of slavery.
1845–1846. The First Anglo-Sikh War.
1848. Lord Dalhousie becomes Governor-General.
1848–1849. The Second Anglo-Sikh War.
1849. Opening of a Hindu girls' school in Calcutta by Drinkwater Bethune.
1852. The Second Anglo-Burmese War.
1853. Railway opened from Bombay to Thana.
Telegraph line from Calcutta to Āgra.
Annexation of Nāgpur.
Cession of Berar.
Renewal of the Company's charter.
1854. Sir Charles Wood's Education Despatch.
1855. The Santāl insurrection.
1856. Annexation of Oudh.
University Act.
1857–1858. The Sepoy Mutiny.
1858. British India placed under the direct government of the Crown.
Queen Victoria's Proclamation.
1859. Indigo disputes in Bengal.
1861. Indian Councils Act.
The Indian High Courts Act.
Introduction of the Penal Code.
1862. Amalgamation of the Supreme and Sadar courts into High Courts.
1863. Death of Dost Muhammad. Ambala Campaign.
1864. Bhutān War.
1865. The Orissa Famine. Opening of telegraphic communication with Europe.
1868. Punjab Tenancy Act. Railway opened from Ambala to Delhi.
Sher 'Ālī, Amīr of Afghānistān, receives an annual grant of six lacs of rupees.

1869. Ambala Conference with Sher 'Ālī.
Yakūb's rebellion in Afghānistān.
1870. Mayo's Provincial Settlement.
1872. Seistan Boundary Report.
1873. Russians reduce Khiva. The Simla Conference.
1874. The Bihār famine. Disraeli becomes Prime Minister in England.
1875. Gāikwār of Baroḍā's case. Visit of the Prince of Wales.
1876. The Royal Titles Act.
1876–1877. Delhi Durbar.
The Queen of England proclaimed Empress of India.
1878. Outbreak of the Second Anglo-Afghān War.
Vernacular Press Act.
1880. 'Abdur Rahmān recognized as Amīr of Afghānistān.
Famine Commission.
1881. Factory Act.
Rendition of Mysore.
1882. Hunter Commission.
1883. The Ilbert Bill.
1885. First Meeting of the Indian National Congress.
Bengal Tenancy Act.
Bengal Local Self-Government Act.
Third Anglo-Burmese War.
1886. Annexation of Upper Burma.
Delimitation of Afghān northern boundary.
1889. Abdication of Mahārājā of Kāshmīr.
Second visit of Prince of Wales.
1891. Factory Act.
Age of Consent Act.
Manipur Rebellion.
1892. Indian Councils Act.
1893. Durand's mission to Kabul.
1895. The Chitral Expedition.
1897. Frontier risings.
Plague at Bombay.
Famine Commission.
1899. Lord Curzon becomes Governor-General.
1900. Famine Commission.
1904. British Expedition to Tibet.
Universities Act.
Co-operative Societies Act.
1905. The First Partition of Bengal.
Lord Minto becomes Governor-General.
Morley Secretary of State for India.

1906. Foundation of the Muslim League.
Congress declaration regarding *Swarāj*.
1907. The Anglo-Russian Convention.
1908. The Newspapers Act.
1909. The Morley-Minto Reforms.
Appointment of S. P. Sinha to the Governor-General's Council.
1910. Lord Crewe Secretary of State for India.
1911. The Delhi Durbar.
Partition of Bengal modified.
Census of India.
1912. Removal of the Imperial capital to Delhi.
1913. Educational Resolution of the Government of India.
1914–1918. The First World War.
1915. Defence of Inda Act.
1916. Sadler Commission.
The Lucknow Pact of the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League.
The Home Rule League founded.
Foundation of the Women's University at Poona.
1917. Mr. Montagu's declaration in the House of Commons. His visit to India.
1917–1918. Indians made eligible for the King's Commission.
The Indian National Liberal Federation.
Report of the Industrial Commssion.
1919. The Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms.
Punjab Disturbances.
Royal Proclamation.
1920. The Khilāfat Movement. The Non-Co-operation Movement.
Lord Sinha, Governor of Bihār and Orissa.
Mahātmā Gāndhi leads the Congress.
1921. Chamber of Princes.
Moplah Rebellion.
The Prince of Wales visits India.
Census of India.
1922. Resignation of Mr. Montagu.
1923. Swarajists in Indian Councils.
Certification of Salt tax.
Question of Indianizing the command of certain regiments —the eight-unit plan.
1925. All-India Depressed Class Association.
Reforms Enquiry Committee Report.
Death of C. R. Dās.

Formation of Inter-University Board.

1926. Reprrt of the Skeen Committee.
Lord Reading's letter to the Nizām.
Royal Commission on Agriculture.
Factories Act.

1927. Indian Navy Act.
Appointment of the Simon Commission.
Capetown Agreement.

1928. Deposition of Amānullah, King of Afghānistān.
All-Parties Conference.
The Nehru Report.
Report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture.

1928–1933. Nādir Shāh, King of Afghānistān.

1929. Lord Irwin's Announcement of 31st October.
Trade Union split.
Establishment of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research.
Lahore Congress.
Appointment of the Royal Commission on Indian Labour.

1930. Civil Disobedience Movement.
Report of the Statutory Commission.
Rebellion in Burma.
Round Table Conference (First Session).

1931. Irwin-Gandhi Pact.
Census of India.
Round Table Conference (Second Session).

1931. Publication of the Royal Labour Commission's Report.

1932. Suppression of the Congress. Round Table Conference (Third Session).
The Communal Award. The Poona Pact.
The Indian Military Academy, Dehra Dun.

1933. Publication of the White Paper.

1934. Civil Disobedience Movement called off.
The Indian Factories Act, 1934.
The Bihār Earthquake.
Joint Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform.

1935. New Government of India Act.

1936. Death of King-Emperor George V (21st January).
Accession and abdication of Edward VIII.
Accession of George VI.

1937. 1st April—Inauguration of Provincial Autonomy.
Congress Ministries in the majority of Provinces.

1939. Second World War begins (3rd September).

Resignation of Congress Ministries and the beginning of political deadlock in India.

1941. Japan enters the war (7th December). Pearl Harbour incident.

1942. Fall of Singapore (15th February).
Evacuation of Rangoon (7th March).
Cripps Mission (22nd March–12th April).
Evacuation of Burma (29th April).
August Revolution and arrest of Indian Leaders.

1943. Lord Wavell Governor-General.
Lord Mountbatten Supreme Commander of South-East Asia.

1944. Gandhi-Jinnah talks opened in Bombay on Śri Rājagopālāchāri's proposals for solution of constitutional deadlock (9th September).
Talks break down on Pakistān issue (27th September).

1945. Lord Wavell's broadcast announcing British Government's determination to go ahead with the task of fitting India for self-government (19th September).
First trial of Indian National Army men opened (5th November).

1946. Mutiny in Royal Indian Navy (18th February).
Announcement of special mission of Cabinet Ministers to India (19th February.)
Cabinet Mission's plan announced (16th May).
British Cabinet's plan for Interim Government announced (16th June).
Muslim League decides to participate in the Interim Government; Congress announces acceptance of the long-term part of 16th May plan, but refuses invitation to participate in Interim Government (25th June).
Muslim League withdraws its acceptance and decides on a policy of direct action (29th July). This leads to outbreak of mob violence in Calcutta (16th August).
Interim Government formed (2nd September).
Muslim League members sworn in (26th October).
Constituent Assembly's first meeting (9th December).

1947. British Government's historic announcement of transfer of power to "responsible Indian hands" not later than June, 1948. Lord Mountbatten's appointment as Viceroy of India in succession to Lord Wavell (20th February).
Announcement of Lord Mountbatten's plan for Partition of India (3rd June).
Indian Independence Act (15th August).

1948. Death of Mahātmā Gandhi (30th January).
Śrī Chakravarti Rājagopālāchāri appointed Governor-General (21st June).
Death of Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah (11th September).
Troops of Government of India enter Hyderābād State (September).

1949. New Constituion of India adopted and signed (26th November).

1950. New Constitution comes into force (26th January).

1951. Inauguration of First Five-Year Plan.

1952. First General Election.
Accession of Queen Elizabeth II.
Chandernagore incorporated with India.

1953. New State of Andhra inaugurated.
Chandigarh inaugurated as capital of the Punjab.

1954. Pondicherry, Karaikal, Mahé, Yanon incorporated with India.

1955. Hindu Marriage Act (18th May).

1956. Nationalization of insurance companies (19th January).
Pakistān proclaimed an Islamic Republic (23rd March).
Hindu Succession Act (17th June).
Reorganization of States (November).
Inauguration of Second Five-Year Plan.
Celebration of 2500th anniversary of death of Gautama Buddha.

1957. Second General Election. Introduction of the decimal system of coinage (1st April).

1958. Introduction of the metric system of weights (1st October).

1959. The Dalai Lama enters Indian territory for political asylum (31st March).
The President takes over the administration of Kerala (31st January).
Sino-Indian border disputes.
Indo-Portuguese dispute.
Arrival of Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the U.S.A., in New Delhi (9th December).

1960. Meeting of the Afro-Asian Conference at New Delhi (19th April). Visits of President Voroshilov and Premier Khrushchev of the U.S.S.R.; President Nasser of the U.A.R., Crown Prince Akihito and Princess Michiko of Japan.

1961. Arrival of Queen Elizabeth and the Duke of Edinburgh at New Delhi (21st January).

Celebrations of the birth centenary of the poet Rabindranath Tagore (8th May.)

1962. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan and Dr. Zakir Hussain sworn in as President and Vice-President of India.

The Chinese invasion of India (October).

1963. Celebrations of the birth centenary of Swami Vivekananda (17th January.)

1964. Massacre of the minorities in East Pakistan creates strong excitement in India (January-February).

Demise of Mr. Jawaharlāl Nehru, Prime Minister of India (27th May).

1966. Tashkent Declaration (10th January).

Death of Lal Bahadur Shastri (11th January).

1969. President Dr. Zakir Hussain passes away; V. V. Giri sworn in as Acting President (3rd May).

V. V. Giri elected President of India (20th August); V. V. Giri sworn in as President of India (21st August).

G. S. Pathak elected as Vice-President of India (30th August), sworn in as Vice-President of India (31st August).

1970. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi inaugurates Meghalaya, a new autonomous Hill State in Assam (2nd April).

A Bill for setting up of 'North-Eastern Council', to co-ordinate the development and security of Assam, Meghalaya, Manipur, and Tripura was passed (11th May).

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi addressed the Silver Jubilee Session of the United Nations (23rd October).

Centre recognized Statehood for Meghalaya (10th November. Statehood conferred on Himachal Pradesh (17th December).

1971. Third World Sanskrit Conference in Allahabad (6th February).

Arrest of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman (26th March).

Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation (18th August).

Pakistān declares war against India (3rd December).

Syed Qasim sworn in as the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir following the death of Sadiq (12th December).

End of Indo-Pakistān War (15th–16th December).

1972. Arrival of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman in New Delhi after being released by the Pakistān Government (19th January).

Mizoram inaugurated as a Union Territory (21st January).

Arrival of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman in Calcutta (16th February), and his talks with India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi (8th February).

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi visits Dacca and a joint statement is issued by India and Bangladesh; India and Bangladesh sign a 25 years treaty of friendship, co-operation and peace (17th–19th March).

India and Pakistān sign an Agreement at Simla, 2nd–3rd July, committing both "to abjure the use of force in resolving differences".

1973–1974. India and the U.S.S.R. sign two Protocols, one on the expansion of the Bhilai Steel Plant and the other on scientific and technological co-operation (17th February).

World meet on Libraries in New Delhi (19th February).

Visits of Prime Ministers of Hungary, East-Germany, Czechoslovakia, and German Democratic Republic, and of President of Sudan.

India's Trade Agreements with these countries. Treaty between India and Portugal; recognition of Bangladesh by Pakistān (February).

Release of a Joint Declaration by India and Bangladesh; the Delhi Agreement among India, Bangladesh and Pakistān; agreement between Delhi, Pindi and Dacca (9th April).

India carried out an underground nuclear experiment (18th May).

Fakhruddin Ali Ahmad sworn in as the President of India (24th August).

B. D. Jatti elected as Vice-President (27th August).

Joint Communique by India and Bangladesh; Indo-Pakistān Trade Agreement (7th December).

1975. First World Hindi Convention inaugurated at Nagpur (10th January).

Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, former President of India passed away in Madras (17th April).

'Aryabhata', the first Indian satellite, launched from the Soviet Union (19th April).

National Women's Day celebrated.

The President declares a state of emergency in the country (25th June).

An Ordinance amending the Maintenance of Internal Security Act issued (29th June).

Announcement of a package of economic measures—the 20-Point Economic Programme (1st July).

The Constitution (Thirty-eighth) Amendment Act (1st August).

The Constitution (Thirty-ninth) Amendment Act (10th August).

1976. The Constitution (Fortieth) Amendment Act (25th March).

Proposals have been made in certain quarters for some changes in the Constitution of India. The Indian National Congress also appointed a Committee with Sardar Swaran Singh as its President to consider the question of amendment of the Constitution. The Committee has made suggestions some of which have seemed to be acceptable, but some go against maintaining proper balance among the three main pillars of our democracy, the legislature, the executive and the judiciary. On 16th July, 1976, the Swaran Singh Committee recommended that a motion of no-confidence in the Council of Ministers either at the Centre or in the State would be valid only when adopted by more than half of the total membership of the House. The Swaran Singh Committee also suggested that it should be the duty of citizens to assist and co-operate with the State in the implementation of the Directive Principles laid down in the Constitution. The Committee also suggested the following fundamental duties of the citizens:

1. Respect and abide by the Constitution and Laws.
2. To hold the sovereignty of the nation and to function in a way as to sustain and strengthen its unity and integrity.
3. Respect the democratic institutions enshrined in the Constitution and not to do anything which may impair their dignity or authority.
4. Defend the country and to render national service including military services when called upon to do so.
5. Abjure communalism in any form.
6. Render assistance and co-operation to the state (" to the State " is the new addition) in the implementation of the Directive Principles of the State policy and to promote the common good of the people so as to subserve the interest of social and economic justice.
7. Abjure violence to protect and safeguard public property and not to do anything which may cause damage or destruction.
8. To pay taxes according to law and the laws.

India's Comprehensive Legislation defining the limits of the territorial waters, the contiguous zone, the continental self, the exclusive zone and the historic waters was passed by the Rajya Sabha (10th August).

A Constitution (Forty-fourth Amendment Bill) was introduced in the Lok Sabha by the Law Minister Mr. H. R. Gokhale (1st September).

The Lok Sabha Constitution (42nd Amendment) Bill, which, as observed by the Law Minister Mr. H. R. Gokhale provide " a framework for the future within which those belonging to legislature, Executive and Judiciary should function " (2nd November).

The Constitution Amendment Bill secured Parliament's approval when the Rajya Sabha put its seal on the measure (11th November).

1977. President Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed passes away in New Delhi; Vice-President Mr. B. D. Jatti sworn in as acting President (12th February).

Fourth round of polling in the Lok Sabha election began. Mr. Morarji Desai, Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee, Mr. Madhu Dandavate, Mr. Mir Sikander Bakt were elected to the Lok Sabha; Mrs. Indira Gandhi was defeated in Rae Bareli; Mr. Bansi Lal was defeated in Bhivani; Mr. Sanjay Gandhi, Mr. H. R. Gokhale, Mr. Bali Ram Bhagat were defeated; Mr. Y. B. Chavan, Mr. C. Subramaniam, Mr. K. Raghuramiah were re-elected and Mr. K. Brahmananda Reddi, Mr. D. K. Barooah were elected (20th March).

Mr. Charan Singh, Mr. Jagjivan Ram, Mr. H. N. Bahuguna, Mr. Biju Patnaik, Mr. Sanjiva Reddi, Mr. George Fernandes, Mr. Madhu Limaye and Mr. Mohan Dharia were elected; Mr. V. C. Shukla was defeated in Raipur; internal emergency promulgated on 25th June, 1975 was withdrawn; Press Censorship was removed; Kerala ruling front wins 111 out of 140 Vidhan Sabha seats (21st March).

Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan gave the call to the people to "oust the Congres" while launching in Delhi the opposition's election campaign. After triumph of the Janata Party and its allies in the Lok Sabha Mrs. Indira Gandhi resigned (22nd March).

Mr. Morarji Desai was elected leader of the Janata Party and he was sworn in as Prime Minister (24th March).

The Government revoked the external emergency promulgated on 3rd December, 1971 (27th March).

Mr. Jagjivan Ram, Mr. Bahuguna, Mr. Raj Narain, Mr. George Fernandes and Mr. Brij Lal Varma were sworn in as Cabinet Ministers (28th March).

Prime Minister Morarji Desai in a broadcast said that his government was pledged to end destitution within a decade. Two Bills, one to repeal the Prevention of Publication of Objectionable Matters Act, 1176 and the other to protect the publication of reports of proceedings of Parliament were introduced in the Lok Sabha (4th April).

Mr. D. K. Barooah resigned as Congress President (13th April).

Mr. Swaran Singh was elected President of the Congress Party (14th April.)

The Janata Party was formally launched at its inaugural Convention at Pragati Maidan, New Delhi. Mr. Chandra Shekhar was chosen President of the Janata Party. The Chairman of the Congress for Democracy, Mr. Jagjivan Ram, announced his decision to merge into the Janata Party (1st May).

Formation of Shah Commission to enquire into the excesses committed during the emergency was formally announced (9th May).

Mr. D. S. Mathur, retired Chief Justice of the Allahabad High Court,

was appointed to enquire into the affairs of the Maruti concern (28th May).

Dr. Sunitikumar Chatterjee, National Professor, died at Calcutta (29th May).

Justice Jaganmohan Reddi, former Judge of the Supreme Court, was appointed to enquire into the Nagarwala affair (6th June).

The Prime Minister arrived in London to attend the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference (7th June).

The Education Minister announced the Government's decision in the Rajya Sabha to dig out the capsule buried at the Red Fort to make it public (20th July).

Mr. Sanjiva Reddi was elected unopposed as President of India. Mr. K. S. Hegde was unanimously elected Speaker of the Lok Sabha (21st July).

Mrs. Indira Gandhi was arrested in New Delhi by C.B.I. on charges of corruption. (3rd October).

Mrs. Indira Gandhi was released unconditionally. The Government filed petition in Delhi High Court challenging the release order of Mrs. Indira Gandhi. Justice J. C. Shah after adjourning public hearing until further notice resumed public hearing on 25th October (4th October).

The A.I.C.C. session began in New Delhi (15th October).

Prime Minister Morarji Desai and the Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev signed a Joint Declaration in Moscow (26th October).

India and Bangladesh formally signed Farakka agreement in Dacca (5th November).

The Jammu and Kashmir Government promulgated an Ordinance with power to detain persons and put checks on newspapers and other publications for the state security and maintenance of public order (6th November).

The Silver Jubilee time Capsule outside the Red Fort was dug out (8th December).

The 44th Constitution Amendment Bill, officially amended at the 43rd Amendment, was passed by the Lok Sabha (20th December).

A composite Bill to repeal the MISA and simultaneously to provide for preventive detention by including a new chapter in the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973, was introduced in the Lok Sabha (23rd December).

Mr. S. A. Dange held that support to emergency was wrong and resigned his post as Chairman of the Communist Party, a post he had been holding since 1962 (30th December).

INDEX

INDEX

A'azz-ud-din Khālid Khānī, 321
'Abbas Mīrza, 744
'Abbās Shāh, 461
'Abbās Shāh II, 466
'Abbasid Khalifahs, the, 318
Abdālīs, the, 728
'Abdul 'Azīz, 457
'Abdul 'Azīz Kufi, Fakhr-ud-dīn, 270
'Abdul Bāqī, 573
'Abdul Hamīd Lāhorī, 313, 465, 467, 470, 565, 574
'Abdul Haqq Dihlawī, 574
'Abdul Huq, 324
'Abdul Khair, Shaikh, 481
'Abdul Latīf, 451
'Abdul Qādir Nāsir-ud-dīn, 343
'Abdullah (governor of Allahābād), 521, 522
'Abdullah Jān (son of Sher 'Ālī), 826
'Abdullah Khān (Sayyid), 562
'Abdullah Khān Uzbeg, 447, 449
'Abdullah, Muhammad, 937, 989
'Abdullah Pani, 499
'Abdullah Qutb Shāh, 472
'Abdullah Shāh (of Golkundā), 469
'Abdur-Nabī, 490
'Abdur Rahamān (son of Abul Fazl), 457
'Abdur Rahamān Chaghatai, 948
'Abdur Rahīm Khān-i-Khānān, 425, 448, 460, 461, 523, 573, 574
'Abdur Rahīm, Sir, 917
'Abdur Rahmān, Amīr, 828, 830, 892
'Abdur Razzāq, 361, 368, 369, 373
'Abdur Razzāq Lārī, 499
Ābhīras, the, 110, 113, 140
Abhisāra, 62, 65
Abolition of Slavery Bills, *see* Slavery, Abolition of, Bills
Abors, the, 898
Ābū, 175, 195, 238, 432
Abu Baqr, 327
Abū Ma'shar, 267
Abu Sa'īd, 315, 343
Abuhar, 317
Abul Fath, 507
Abul Fath Khān (Mahmūd Begarha), 345, 349, 354
Abul Fazl, 274, 309, 440, 443, 447, 450, 451, 453, 457, 462, 557, 559, 563, 566, 567, 571, 573, 579, 592, 594
Abul Hasan (of Golkundā), 499
Abul Hasan (of Herāt), 592
Abul-Muzaffar 'Alā-ud-dīn Bahman Shāh ('Alā-ud-dīn Hasan), 318, 349
Abwābs, the, 311, 386
Abyssinians, the, 369, 388, 488, 514
——(slaves), 278, 339, 460
Achārya Narendra Dev University of Agriculture and Technology, Faizabad, 963
Āchāryas, the, 198
Ache, Admiral d', 658, 659, 660
Achyuta, 139
Achyuta Rāya, 365, 370
Acworth, Sir William, 926
Adam, John, 723, 808
Adam, William, 813
Ādam Khān, 440, 441, 453
Adams, Major Thomas, 664
Adbhutasagara, the, 180
Aden, 910
Adhikārin, the, 188
Ādi Brāhma Samāj, the, 870
Ādi Granth, the, 492
'Ādil Khān I (of Khandesh), 349
'Ādil Khān II, 349
'Ādil Khān III, 349
'Ādil Shāh Sūr, 396, 438, 439, 506
'Ādil Shāhī dynasty, 357, 594
Ādīna, 336
Ādīna Beg Khān, 528, 541, 542
Ādiśūra, 158
Aditi, 37
Ādtiya Chola, 166, 170
Ādityadeva, 152
Ādityasena, 145
Ādityavamsa, 207
Advaita, 196
Advisory Planning Board, 955
Adyar (Madras), 876
Aelian, 127
Afghān Wars, 744–51, 754, 755, 756 759, 823, 825, 829, 892
Afghānistān, 93, 94, 95, 111, 112, 741, 53, 823–31, 833, 891–3, 987, 1025. *See also* Afghāns, the
Afghānpur, 308
Afghāns, the, 171, 179, 221, 227, 268, 272, 281, 288, 328, 332, 333, 334, 335, 344, 379, 388, 390, 396, 418, 420, 421, 422, 418–40, 459, 464, 475, 476, 487, 488, 497, 524–9

passim, 532, 542, 543, 684, 722, 729, 732, 739, 740, 825, 830–1. *See also* Afghānistān
Afghāns, Ruhelā, the, 522, 542, 684–6
Africa, 9
Africans, the, 203, 352, 405, 510, 800
Afrīdīs, the, 487, 488, 839, 891
Afro-Asian Nations, 952, 1023
Afzal Khān, 506, 507
Āgā Rezā, 592
Age of Consent Act, 877
Agnew, Vans, 738
Agni, the Fire-god, 24, 26, 34, 37, 39, 44
Agnīmitra, 108
Āgra, 287, 333, 334, 420, 421, 423, 429, 430, 431, 434, 438, 439, 442, 443, 456, 460, 461, 463, 465, 466, 470, 475, 476, 477, 478, 481, 484, 486, 500, 508, 509, 520, 522, 533, 535, 536, 559, 563, 564, 566, 571, 575, 577, 581, 584, 586, 629, 695, 698, 753, 772,
—— Canal, 864
Agriculture: early Vedic, 33; Aryan, 45; Magadhan, 75; Mauryan, 128; Modern, 928–30, 958–9, 1021
Ahalyā Bāi, 671, 672
Āhavamalla, 181
Ahichchhatrā (Rohilkhand), 139, 150
Ahimsā, doctrine of, 78, 80, 94, 194
Ahmad (son of Ayāz), 308
Ahmad Chap Malik, 289, 290, 291
Ahmad Khān (of Mewāt), 332
Ahmad Nizām Shāh, 349
Ahmad Shāh (of Delhi), 522
Ahmad Shāh I (of Gujarāt), 343, 345, 349, 352, 411
Ahmad Shāh Abdālī, 526, 527–9, 535, 541–6 *passim*, 728, 729, 741
Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī, 352, 353
Ahmad Shāh Durrānī, 743, 753
Ahmad Shāhī dynasty, the, 412
Ahmad Thānesvarī, 403
Ahmad Ullah, 766
Ahmad Yadgar, 438
Ahmadābād, 345, 411, 427, 445, 475, 563, 567, 584, 629, 670, 804, 888, 922
Ahmadnagar, 169, 358, 365, 403, 415, 438, 449, 460, 464, 468, 469, 498, 501, 504, 506, 519, 558, 591, 695, 697
Ahmed, Aziz, 1013, 1016
Ahmed, Fakhruddin Ali, 953
Ahmed, Tajuddin, 1012
Āhoms, the, 340, 382, 485, 486
Ahsan Shāh, Jalāl-ud-dīn, 317
Ahsanābād (Gulbarga), 350
Aihole inscription, 160
Āimal (son of Khān Jahān Lodī), 464
Āin-i-Akbarī, the, 454, 550, 551, 552 573, 576
'Ain-ul-mulk, 295, 304, 305, 317
Aitamar Kachlan, 286
Aitamar Surkha, 286
Aitareya Brāhmana, the, 53, 54
Aix-la-Chapelle, Treaty of, 640
Aiyangar, S. Srinivas, 376
Ajantā caves, 235, 236, 246
——hills, 697
Ajātaśatru, 57–8, 59, 69, 89
Ajit Singh, 494, 495, 497, 533, 534
Ajivikas, 80, 99, 102, 103, 132, 133, 194, 201
Ajmer, 178, 269, 274, 421, 432, 440, 464, 479, 495, 496, 498, 533, 584, 991
Ākat Khān, 294, 299
Akbar, 348, 349, 379, 395, 415, 418, 424, 425, 427, 428, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440–55, 458, 468, 483, 490, 492, 495–9 *passim*, 503, 524, 547, 549–57 *passim*, 562, 565, 84 *passim*, 591, 592, 593, 594, 817
Akbar II, 523, 721
Akbar Khān (son of Dost Muhammad), 749, 750
Akbar, Prince, 549
Akbarnāmāh, the, 573
Akmal Khān, 487
Akshapatalādhikrita, the, 186
Al-Bailaman (Vallamandala), 172
Al-Biruni, 8, 173, 189
Al-Hajjaj, 172
Al-Jurz (Gurjjara), 172
Al-Kikan, 171
Al-Masūdī, 162
Al-Mu'tasim, 282
'Alā-ud-dīn (of Kāshmīr), 347
'Alā-ud-dīn (brother-in-law of Nusrat Shāh), 341
'Alā-ud-din, Sultān ('Ālī Mardān Khaljī), 275
'Alā-ud-dīn Ahmad Bahmanī, 349
'Alā-ud-din 'Ālī Shāh, 335–6
'Alā-ud-din II Bahmanī, 353, 354, 503
'Alā-ud-dīn Fīrūz Shāh, 337, 341
'Alā-ud-dīn Hasan Bahman Shāh (Abul Muzaffar), 318, 350, 351
Alā-ud-din Husain (the *Jahānsūz*), 269
'Alā-ud-dīn Husain Shāh (of Bengal), 333, 339, 382, 394, 395–401, 410
'Alā-ud-din Jānī 276
'Alā-ud-dīn Khalji, 175, 182, 289–303,

306, 307, 309, 312, 315, 322, 342, 344, 348, 385, 386, 387, 391, 392, 395, 402, 403, 407, 435
'Alā-ud-din Ma'sūd, 279
'Alai Darwāza, the, 407
'Alāis, the, 305
'Alām Khān, 334, 419, 420
'Ālam Shāh, 510
'Ālam Shāh I (Bahādur Shāh of Delhi), 497
'Ālam Shāh II ('Ālī Gauhar), 523, 528, 546, 662, 664, 665, 668, 672, 684, 697, 721
'Ālam Shāh Sayyid, 331, 336
'Ālamchānd, 532
'Ālamgīr II, 522, 523, 528
'Alamgirnāmāh, the, 574
Alāwal, 562
Albuquerque, 364, 624
Alexander of Epirus, 98
Alexander the Great, 63–6, 77, 78, 91, 92, 105, 203, 292, 293, 453, 661
Alexandria, 135, 203, 368, 710
'Ālī 'Ādil Shāh I, 358
'Ālī Ambar Jaini, Shaikh, 437
'Ālī Beg, 292
'Ālī Gauhar, *see* 'Ālam Shah II
'Ālī Husain (of the Carnatic), 712
'Ālī Jāh, 710
'Ālī Mardān Khaljī, 275
'Ālī Mardān Khān (governor of Qandahār), 466, 467, 471, 564
'Ālī Masjīd, 487, 827
'Ali, Muhammad, 971
Alī Muhammad Ruhela, 685
'Ālī Naqī, 477
'Ālī Qulī Beg Istajhī, 458
'Ālī Shāh (of Kāshmīr), 348
'Ālī Shaukat, 971
'Ālīgarh, 536, 543
—— Movement, 940
—— University, 885, 943
'Ālim 'Ālī Sayyid, 530
'Ālīnagar, Treaty of, 652, 653
'Ālivārdī Khān, 532, 576, 647, 648, 651, 654, 657, 674, 800, 801
'Āliwal, 736
Allāhābād, 138, 150, 152, 178, 184, 186, 397, 450, 509, 521, 531, 582, 684, 767, 769, 770, 775, 796, 798, 917
Allāhābad, Pillar Inscription, 138, 139
——, Treaty of, 665, 783
All-India Women's Conference, 966
All Parties Convention (1928) 973
Almorā, 715, 716
Ālomprā (Burman), 723
Alor, 172
Alp Khān (governor of Gujarāt), 296
Alp Khān (of Mālwa), *see* Hūshang Shāh
Alphabets, Indian, 205, 223
Alptigin (of Ghazni), 172
Alptigīn, General (Amīr Khān), 283, 284
Ālvārs, the, 198
Alwār, 426, 838
Amalguzār, the, 555
'Amal-i-Sālih, the, 574
Amānullah, King of Afghānistān, 982–93
Amar Singh (of Mewār), 444, 459
Amar Singh Thapa, 715
Amarāvati, 109, 229
—— sculpture, 230
Amardās, Guru, 492
Amarkot, 437, 562, 756
Amātya, the, 186, 511
Ambā, 90
Ambālā, 735, 770, 825
Ambashṭhas, the, 63
Ambedkar, Dr., 908, 983
Amber, 421, 533
Āmbhi, 63, 65, 77, 105
Amboyna, 625
Ambur, 642, 680
America, 645, 676, 709, 802, 875, 933, 939, 950, 952, 961, 966
Amherst, Lord, 723, 724, 726, 811
Amiens, Peace of, 710
Āmils, the, 388, 788
Amīn, the, 433–4
Amīn Khān (governor of Afghānistān), 487
Amīn Khān Wazīr, 530
Amīnāī Qazwīnī, 574
Amīr 'Ālī Barīd, 356, 359
Amīr Habibullah, 891-2
Amīr Husain (governor of Jedda) 346
Amīr-i-Ākhur, the 271
Amīr-i-Behr, the, 386
Amīr Khān (Alptigin), 283, 284
Amīr Khān (of Tonk), 700, 701, 702, 718, 719, 720
Amīr Khusrav, 267, 284, 294, 295, 297, 298, 299, 302, 306, 307, 309, 384, 389, 390, 392, 395, 402, 403
Amīr Timūr, *see* Timūr
Amīr Turghay, 328
Amīr-ul-Umarā, *see* Iltutmish
'Amir 'Umar, 299
Amitraghāta, 94
Amitrochates (Bindusara), 126
Amoghavarsha I, 169, 185, 195
Ampthill, Lord, 892
Amrakārddava, 142
Amritsar, 492, 699, 728, 731, 737, 940, 971

Amroha, 292
Āmuktamālyadā, the, 371, 373
Ānandamayī (of Bengal), 577
Ānandāpala, 173
Ānandpur, 493
Anantavarman Choda Ganga, 183, 377
Anarkarli, 459
Andaman Islands, 11, 991
Anderson, Lieut., 738
Andhras, the, 40, 54, 109, 148, 164, 168, 189, 377
Andhūi, 272
Andrews, C.F., 872
Anegundī, 359
Anga, 39, 54, 57, 81
Angad, Guru, 492
Angirases, the, 35
Angkor Thom (Vaśo-dharapura), 210
Angkor Vat, 210, 214
Anglo-Afghān Wars, 744–51, 754, 755, 756, 759, 823, 824, 828, 892
Anglo-Burmese Wars, 723–8, 741, 767, 857
Anglo-Indian community, 881, 906, 1007
Anglo-Marātha Wars, 668–71, 691–8, 699–702, 778
Anglo-Mysore Wars, 674–80, 704–7
Anglo-Oriental College, 885
Anglo-Oudh Treaty, 684
Anglo-Sikh Wars, 734–41
Angrias, the, 513, 541
Annam, 206, 207, 233, 241
Antialkidas, 111, 133
Antigonos, 98
Antiochos I Soter, 94, 126
Antiochos II Theos, 96, 98, 103
Antiochos III, the Great, 103, 108
Anuruddha, 59
Anus, the, 25, 26
Anwār-ud-dīn, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642,
Aornos, 63–4, 65
Apāchyas, the, 53
Apālā, 30
Aparājita Pallava, 166, 170
Aparānta, Buddhism in, 133
Aparārka, 185
Appa Sāheb, 701, 702
Appar, 196
Āṛā inscription, 116
Arab Countries, relations with India, 1029
Arabia, 187, 330, 347, 369, 705, 799
Arabian Sea, 203
Arabic, 348, 394, 573, 810, 811, 812
Arabs, the, 161, 162, 168, 171, 203, 204, 212, 267, 352, 388, 403, 623, 624
—— in Sind, 267
Arākān, 478, 486, 557, 723, 724, 725, 831
Ārām Baksh, 274–5
Āranyakas, the, 50–1
Arasanī, 324
Āravīdus, the, 367, 372, 602
Archaeological Survey, 230, 412, 961
Architecture, *see* Art
Arcot, 541, 638, 642, 643, 644, 671, 676, 682
Argāon, 695
Arhats, 44, 133
Arīf, the slave, 470
Arikera, 680
Aristotle, 293
Ariz, the, 282
Arjan Mal, Guru, 457, 458, 492, 493
Arjuna (in the *Rāmāyana*), 86–90
Arjuna (Arunāśva), 153–4
Arjuna (of Gujarāt), 175
Arkalī Khān, 291
Armāgāon, 629
Armenians, the, 799
Armies: Aryan, 29; Magadhan, 69; Mauryan, 121; Gupta, 187; Khalji, 300; Tughluq, 325; Vijayanagar, 376; Turko-Afghān, 388, 435; Marāthā, 513, 540; Afghān, 543; Mughul, 549, 557–8; British Indian, 775, 809, 864–5, 916, 921-3, 949, 950–1; Indian State Forces, 923, 951
Arms Act, 880, 882
Arno, 950
Arnold, Sir E., 762
Arras, 669
Arrian, 117, 126
Arsakes, the, 112
Art and Architecture: Ancient, 35, 217–36; Deccan (Upper) 243; Medieval, 237, 246; Modern, 971; Mughul, 577–89; Mysore, 244–5; North and South India, 237–43; Turko-Afghān, 403–15; Vijayanagar, 370; *see also* Artists, Monuments *and* Music
Arunachal Pradesh, 989
Artists: in the Mughāl Court, 589–94
Modern Indian, 947–8
Arunāśva (Arjun), 153
Āruṇi, 40
Ārya Samāj, the, 873–5, 938, 940, 942, 945
Āryabhata, 142, 200
Āryadeva, 135
Aryans, the, 4, 13, 14, 22, 23, 24–38, 126, 202
Āryāvarta, 5, 108, 139, 141, 147,
Asad, 456
Asad Khān (of Bijāpur), 365, 396

Asad Khān (Irānī), 524
Asadullāh (of Birbhūm), 576
Āsaf Jāh, *see* Nizām-ul-mulk Āsaf Jāh
Āsaf Khān (governor of Karā), 441, 443
Āsaf Khān (brother of Nūr Jahān), 459, 462, 463, 464
Āsaf-ud-daulah, 688, 689
Āsandīvat, 40
Asaṇga, 194
Āsāwal (Ahmadābād), 345
Ashṭapradhān, the, 511
Ashti, 702
Asia, 175, 203, 216, 227, 230, 268, 351, 390, 405, 414, 424, 447, 461, 467, 477, 485, 550, 565, 568, 722, 723, 744
Asian Relations Conference (1947), New Delhi, 952, 1023
Asiatic Review, 950
Asiatic Society of Bengal, the, 810, 946
Asirgarh, 345, 349, 441, 449, 468, 499, 695, 718
'Askarī, 425, 426, 427, 437,
Aśmaka, 54
Aśoka, 35, 56, 66, 82, 83, 84, 94–101, 103, 104, 105, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126, 127, 132, 133, 134, 141, 168, 203, 217, 219, 221, 223, 224, 230, 231, 324, 433
Aśramas, the, 32, 126
Assam, 157, 179, 340, 381, 293, 431, 485, 486, 493, 722, 724, 725, 794, 835, 866, 897, 898, 906, 911, 914, 945, 948, 979, 989, 990, 1000, 1006–7
Assaye, 695
Astadiggajas (Telegu), the, 372
Astronomy, College of, 182, 191
Aśvaghosha, 115, 135
Aśvakas, the, 62
Aśvalāyana, 86
Aśvamedha, rite of, *see* Horse-Sacrifice
Aśvamedha Parva, the, 401
Aśvapati, 147
Aśvatthāmā, 207
Aśvins, the, 37
Atāla Masjid, the, 341
Atchison, Sir C, 776, 849
Atharva Veda the, 28, 40, 42, 46, 50, 474, 573
Athavane, the, 375
Athenaios, 126
Athens, 135
Atisa Dīpankara, 159, 205
Ātman, 51
Aṭṭāra, 55
Atomic Energy Commission, 964
Atri, 35
Attlee, C.R. 978
Attock, 487, 529, 541, 728, 732
Auchinleck, Gen., 950
Auckland, Lord, 750–8 *passim*, 754, 755, 759, 763, 814
Augustus, 110, 203
Aungier, Gerald, 631
Aurangābād, 471, 472, 695
Aurangzeb, 358, 359, 448, 460, 461, 466, 467, 470–80, 484–503, 520, 522, 524, 530, 532, 533, 535, 536, 541, 548–60 *passim*, 562, 565, 568, 569, 572, 574, 576, 577, 589, 593, 594, 631–2, 633
Aurora, Jagjit Singh, 1012, 1013
Austen, Admiral, 727
Australia, gold in, 858
Australian India Association, 952
Austrian Succession, War of, 638, 640, 647
Austrians, 891
Avā, 725, 726, 727
Avamukta, 140
Avanti, 54, 55, 58, 59, 106, 161
Avantivarman (Maukhari), 148, 155
Avatāras, the, 46
Awamí Leage, 1014
Awami Leaguc Party, 1011, 1012
Axis, 940
Ayodhyā, 55, 87, 88, 167
Ayub Khān, 828, 1010
Azad, Maulana Abul Kalam, 971
Azad Hind Fouz, 978
Azadpur, *see* Ikdala
'A'zam-i-Humāyūn Lodi, 332
'A'zam Shāh (son of Aurangzeb), 495, 496, 499, 520, 536
Āzarī, Shaikh, 352
Azes I, 112
Azes II, 112, 113
Azilises, 112
'Azīm-ud-daulah, 712
'Azim-us-Shān, 520, 628
'Azīmullah Khān, 766
'Aziz (son of Khān Jahān Lodi), 464
'Azīz-ud-din ('Ālamgīr II), 522, 523, 528

Bābur, 273, 334, 356, 392, 395, 415, 418–25, 427, 428, 429, 431, 437, 442, 524, 547, 557, 573, 577, 591
Bābur, Memoirs of, 424, 425, 562, 577
Babylon, 45, 65, 66, 76, 77, 91, 93, 105, 202, 274
Bachai-i-Saqqao, 893
Bacteria, 111, 227
Badakshān, 467, 470, 524

Badal (Rājput), 294
Bādāmī, 167, 198, 243, 244, 673
Badan Singh (Jāt), 535
Bādarāyana, 196
Badāūn, 271, 275, 277, 299, 301, 332,
Badāūnī, 276, 307, 310, 311, 312, 315, 318, 319, 440, 441, 451, 452, 453, 564, 573
Baden-Powell, Lord, 939
Badli Sari, 770
Badr-i-Chāch, 310
Badrināth, 196
Bāgh, 236, 246
Baghat, 761
Baghdād, 169, 267, 275, 280, 282, 384 402
Baghelkhand, 169, 170
Bāglāna, 346, 470, 496, 510
Bahādur Khān, 479, 480
Bahādur Shāh I (of Delhi), 496, 497
Bahādur Shāh II (of Delhī), 523, 524, 766, 768, 771
Bahādur Shāh (of Gujarāt), 344, 347, 425, 426, 427, 430, 530, 533, 534, 576
Bahādurgarh, 516
Bahar Khān Lohāni, 429
Baharimad, 172
Bahā-ud-din Gurshāsp, 316
Bahawālpur, 747
Bahman (son of Isfandiyār), 349, 350
Bahmanābād, 172
Bahmani dynasty, the, 109, 318, 343, 349–56, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 377, 403, 413, 414, 503, 578; genealogical table, 599
Bahraich, 329
Bahrām Aiba (Kishlū Khān), 317
Bahrām Khān (Tārtār Khān), 320, 335
Bahrām Shāh, 268
Bāhur, 191
Baillie, Colonel William, 676
Bairam Khān, 438, 439, 440, 553
Baird, Sir David, 710
Baiza Bāī, Mahārānī, 759
Bajaur, 111, 447
Bāji Rao I, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 703
Bāji Rao II, 691, 692, 693, 700, 701, 702, 762, 765
Bājpai, Shrī Rām, 939
Bājwara, 428
Bakarai, 202
Bakhala, 428
Bakhsi Ghulam Mohammad, 988
Bakshī, the, 386, 550
Bala Hissār (Kābul), the, 749, 750, 752
Balāditya (Narasimha Gupta), 144
Balāghāt (Deccan), 472
Bālājī II (Nānā Sāheb, Bālājī Bāji Rao), 539–41, 542, 545
Bālājī Viswanāth, 536, 537
Bālaputradeva, 158
Balarām Seth, 699
Balāsore, 630, 632, 696
Balavarman, 139
Balban Ghiyās-ud-din, 271, 280–6, 287, 302, 306, 335, 387, 402
Baldwin, Stanley (Earl Baldwin), 907
Balhara (*Vallabharāja*), the, 169
Balhika-Pratipīya, 40
Bali, 206, 212, 215
Balkh, 467, 468, 470, 488, 743
Ballālasena, 180, 185
Baloch tribes, the, 722
Balochpur, 461
Baluchistān 3, 15, 23, 94, 171, 447, 748, 753, 756, 977,
Ban Pal, Rānā, 395
Bāṇa, 103, 119, 128, 141, 142, 154, 160, 171, 194, 196, 198, 200, 201
Banavāsi, 110, 164
Bāndā, 534, 728
Bandagān-i-Khās, the, 392
Bandhupālita, 102
Bandulā (Burman), 724
Bandung Conference, 952, 1007, 1023
Banerjea, Surendranāth, 854, 879, 880, 881, 967, 968,
Banerjee, Sir Gurudās, 943
Bāngad, 946
Bangali, 1010
Bangalore, 680
Bangladesh, 1010-18, 1024, 1025, 1029
Bangladesh Jatiyo League, 1014
Bani (Bhandī), 148
Banian, 276
Bank nationalisation, 959, 1000, 1020
Bankideva-Ālupendra, 296
Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertaking) Bill, 959, 1020
Banswārā, 720
Bantam, 629, 636
Bar Nadī, river, 485
Barā Sonā Masjid, the, 341, 411
Barabar hills, 221
Barabudur, 212, 213, 214
Barakzāis, the, 742, 743, 746, 747
Baramahal district, 680, 794
Barārī Ghāt, 542
Barāsat (Bengal), 765
Bārbak Shāh Lodī, 332, 333, 342
Bārbak Shāh, Rukn-ud-dīn, 338
Bārbak Shāh, Sultan Shāhzāda, 330 400
Barbarike, 202

Barbary, 488
Barbosa, E., 368, 369, 372, 390
Bardoli, 972
Bareilly, 765, 769, 772
Bargī-giri, 460
Bārha, the Sayyids of, 524
Bārīd Shāhī dynasty, 357, 358
Barker, Sir Robert, 684, 685
Barlās Turks, the, 328
Barlow, Sir George, 699, 715
Barnett, Commodore Curtis, 639
Barnī, Zia-ud-dīn, 271, 281, 282, 284, 288, 289, 290, 293, 299, 301, 302, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 316, 319, 402, 403
Barodā, 519, 539, 629, 700, 701, 836, 838, 862, 948, 985
Bārrāckpore, 726, 768
Barthema, L. di, 390, 391
Bartoli, F., 452
Barwas (Broach), 172
Barwell, Richard, 778
Barygaza, 202
Basālat Jang, 681
Basava, 195, 196
Basawān (artist), 592
Basra, 488, 800
Bassein, 510, 539, 568, 624, 669, 670, 693
——, Treaty of, 693, 694, 695
Bassein (Burma), 727
Basti district, 715
Bastille, the, 661
Basu, B. N., 899
Bātāi, 471
Batavia, 625, 710
Bayāna, 329, 421
Bāyazīd (the Mehdi), 447
Bāyazīd (son of Sulaimān Kararānī), 379
Bāyazīd Shāh (of Bengal), 337
Bayon, temple of, 210
Bāz Bahādur (of Mālwa), 343, 413, 441, 442, 594
Beaconsfield, Lord, *see* Disraeli
Beas, river, 737
Becher, Richard, 667
Beck, Mr., 885, 886
Bedara (Biderra), 625, 662
Bednore, 541, 674
Bednūr (Keladi), 367
Begams of Oudh, case of the, 688–9, 757
Begara, the, 375
Belgaum, 510
Belgium, 949
Bellary district, 11, 510
Benāras, 985
Benāres, 72, 76, 174, 178, 179, 180, 275, 336, 397, 398, 475, 509, 531, 563, 565, 575, 686–7, 689, 713, 769, 770, 796, 804, 810, 844, 876
——, Treaty of, 668, 684, 685, 686, 687
——, University of, 943, 947
Bengal: under Pālas, 156–60, 161, 184; under later Pālas and Senas, 178, 179–80, 269; under Guptas, 187; Jainism in, 194, 195; Buddhism in, 212; under Turko-Afghāns, 271, 275, 276, 277, 278, 283, 287, 307, 308, 312, 317, 320, 321, 324, 329, 333, 335–41, 376, 379, 381, 382, 395, 430, 431, 436, 439; under Mughuls, 418, 422, 430, 445, 446, 459, 461, 464, 475, 478, 486, 500, 522, 554, 557, 561, 564, 567, 569; Subahdārs of, 529, 531–2; Portuguese in, 464–5, 799; Dutch in, 626, 627, 799, 800; East India Company's factories in, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 637, 641, 799, 800–3; French in, 635, 658, 799; establishment of British supremacy in, 661–7, 674, 697, 711, 712, 713, 717, 721, 724, 757, 777; Afghān threat to, 742, 743; industry and trade, 206, 390, 391, 392, 564, 565, 566, 567, 630, 799–804, 888; literature, 400, 403, 575, 576, 577, 807, 811, 946; art and architecture, 405, 410, 593; revenue system, 554, 783, 784–7, 803; British administration of, 777, 781, 782, 783–94, 795, 796, 797, 807, 844, 845, 852, 860, 864, 865, 866, 901, 902, 905, 911, 912, 914, 931, 932, 943, 957, 958, 967*ff*, 979, 980, 981; social and religious reforms; 810, 816, 869, 868, 870, 871, 957; partition of, 866, 897, 912, 914, 967–9, 980, 981; famine of, 1943, 958; English education in, 810, 811, 812, 813, 943
—— Kings of, 597–8
—— Presidency of, 914
——, West, 991, 993
Bengali language and literature, 337, 400, 401, 403, 562, 575, 576, 577, 807, 811, 946
Bengalis, 1015
Benson, Colonel, 725
Bentinck, Lord William, 707, 732, 744, 753, 758, 762, 766, 794, 796, 812, 812, 819, 820
Berar, 102, 108, 110, 164, 346, 350, 353, 357, 365, 415, 438, 449, 468, 470, 509, 519, 537, 539, 674, 676, 762, 931, 991

Berhampore, 768
Bering Strait, 744
Berlin, Treaty of, 827, 829
Bernier, François, 480, 481, 566, 567, 593
Besant, Annie, 876, 941, 976
Besnager, 107, 133, 139, 231
Best, Captain Thomas, 629
Betwā, river, 772
Beveridge, Sir William, 425, 462, 712, 713
Bezwāda, 363
Bhadrabāhu, 81, 134
Bhadrasāla, 106
Bhagadattas (of Kāmarūpa), the, 154
Bhagavad Gītā, the, 79, 90, 193, 196, 592
Bhagavat, 99
Bhāgavata Purāṇa, the, 198, 401
Bhāgavatas (or Vaishnavas), the, 47, 66, 79, 80, 89, 133, 192, 194, 198
Bhāgū (of the Yūsufzāīs), 487
Bhagwān Dās, 442, 447, 574
Bhajan, 399
Bhakkar, 437
Bhakt Singh, 534
Bhaktavatsalam, M., 965
Bhakti cult, the, 21, 36, 79, 192, 193, 198, 200, 396, 870
Bhāktiratnākar, the, 576
Bhandarkar, Dr., 398
Bhana Mal, Rāi, 395
Bhaṇḍi, 149, 184
Bhānu-deva, 296
Bhānuchandra Upādhāyya, 451
Bharadvāja, 25, 35
Bhārat Itihasa Samsodhaka Mandala, the, 947
Bharat Seva Sangh, 1011
Bhārata, 3, 7, 87,
Bhārata-Varsha, 3, 7
Bharatas, the, 25, 26, 27, 40
Bharatpur, 536, 697, 698, 726, 833
Bhāravi, 200, 201
Bhargas, the, 55
Bhārhut, 223, 224, 227, 228, 230
Bhartrihari, 200
Bhāsa, 58
Bhāskhar Pandit, 532
Bhāskara, 201
Bhāskarāchārya, 182, 191
Bhāskaravarman, 140, 153, 156
Bhatgāon (Nepāl), 383
Bhātinda, 282, 331
Bhatkal, 364, 568
Bhatnair, 282
Bhatrihari, 201
Bhattanārāyana, 201
Bhaṭṭikāvya, the, 200
Bhāturiā, 337
Bhavabhūti, 154, 200, 201
Bhilai, 955
Bhillama, 182
Bhīls, the, 14, 45, 942
Bhīlsa, 276, 289, 290
Bhīma I (of Gujarāt), 175
Bhīma (Kaivarta), 159
Bhīma (Shāhi), 163, 173
Bhīmasena, 88
Bhīmdev II (of Gujarāt), 271
Bhīmsen, 498, 519, 573
Bhīmsen Burhānpurī, 472
Bhinmal (Broach), 172
Bhīshma, 89
Bhītargāon, 236
Bhitari seal inscription, 144
Bhiwāndī, 506
Bhogavarman Maukhari, 154
Bhoi dynasty, the, 379
Bhoja (of Dhārā), 201
Bhoja (of Mālwa), 175, 178, 191
Bhoja I (of Kanauj), 155, 161, 169, 178, 185
Bhoja II, 162
Bhojas, the, 53, 54
Bhojpur, 281
Bhongir, 350
Bhonslas, genealogical tables, 606
Bhoodan, 1019
Bhopāl, 441, 539, 720, 769, 985, 991
——, Begam of, 941
Bhotiyas, the, 189
Bhoṭṭa-vishṭi, 187
Bhṛigukachcha, 76
Bhuiyas, the, 381
Bhujyu, 34
Bhukti, the, 188
Bhutan, 390, 716, 897, 1012
Bhutiyas, the, 14
Bhutto, Zulfiqar Ali, 1013, 1014
Bhuvaneswar, 237
Bibigarh (Cawnpore), 770
Bible, the, 474, 810
Bīdar, 350, 352, 353, 354, 355, 359, 363, 377, 413, 438, 469, 473, 541
Bihār, 137, 138, 178, 179, 190, 221, 269, 271, 289, 329, 333, 334, 422, 423, 429, 430, 445, 530, 532, 554, 564, 565, 566, 626, 630, 662, 665, 713, 732, 741, 769, 783, 794, 818, 861, 862, 865, 901, 906, 910, 914, 925, 932, 937, 941, 957, 980, 991, 993
Bihārī Mall, Rājā (of Amber), 442
Biḥzād (of Herāt), 591
Bijāpur, 167, 169, 357, 358, 359, 363, 365, 367, 403, 405, 414, 448, 449 450, 468, 469, 472, 473, 479, 484, 498, 504, 505, 506, 508, 512, 514, 520, 530, 541, 591, 593
Bijjala Kalachurya, 181, 195, 196
Bikāner, 443, 720

Bilāspur, 991
Bilgrāmī, Syed Husain, 943
Bilhana, 181, 201
Bilhāpur, 538
Bimbisāra, 56–7, 59, 61, 137
Bimlipatam, 626
Bindusāra, 94–5, 104, 126, 133
Bīr Nārāyan, 441
Bīr Singh Bundelā, 457, 464
Bīrbal, Kavi Priya, 574
Birkenhead, Lord, 907, 970
Bishan Dās, 592
Bisnaga (Vijayanagar), 370
Biswa Simha, 382
Bithal Nāth, 572
Bithur, 702, 759
Bitikchī, the, 555
Biyāna, 293, 327, 333, 564, 577, 629
Black Hole of Calcutta, the, 649, 650
Blavātsky, Madame, 876
Blunt, W.S., 848
Board of Control, 683, 691, 694, 775, 780, 781, 782, 808, 809, 814, 815, 840, 841, 842, 847, 858
Board of Revenue, 765
Bodawpaya (Burma), 723
Bodh-Gayā, 82, 96, 138, 223, 224, 227, 230
Bodhisatva, 228
Boghaz Keui, 25, 26
Bogle, George, 895
Boigne, Benoit de, 672
Bokaro, 955
Bolan Pass, the, 747, 752
Bolshevism, 893
Bombay, 510, 624, 626, 627, 629, 630, 631, 632, 634, 641, 658, 659, 660, 676, 680, 735, 745, 761, 766, 769, 778, 780, 781, 782, 796, 797, 798, 800, 813, 815, 824, 844, 845, 851, 853, 854–5, 861, 862, 864, 865, 869, 872, 887, 888, 901, 905, 907, 910, 911, 917, 919, 920, 928, 932, 940, 941, 948, 972, 984, 985, 986, 991, 993
—— Industrial Relations Act (1946), 957
—— Presidency Association, 881
—— School of Art, 948
Bombay-Burma Trading Corporation, 832, 833
Bombay Telegraph, 771
Bonnerjea, W. C., 881
Boone, Charles, 634
Bopadeva, 182
Borneo, 206, 212
Boscawen, Admiral Edward, 640, 641
Bose, Sir J. C., 947
Bose, Nandalāl, 948
Bose, Rājnārāyan, 884
Bose, Rash Behary, 1026
Bose, Subhas Chandra, 976, 977, 978, 1027
Botanical Survey of India, 947
Boughton, Gabriel, 470
Boy Scouts, Indian, 939, 942
Bradlaugh, Charles, 883
Brahmā, 37, 46, 51, 73, 74, 78, 127
Brāhma Sabhā, the, 872
Brāhma Samāj, the, 809, 868–71, 873, 874, 875, 938, 945
Brāhma Sūtras, the, 196
Brahmadeva, 167
Brahmajit Gaur, 435
Brāhmana caste, the, 31, 41, 42, 44, 56, 68, 74, 75, 78, 83, 86, 99, 100, 103, 108, 122, 125, 128, 134, 155, 160, 184, 187, 188, 194, 207, 348, 364, 370, 373, 403, 474, 493, 509, 514
Brāhmanapāla, 173
Brāhmaṇas, the Vedic, 26, 50
Brahmanaspati, 37
Brāhmanism, 73, 74, 77–80, 132, 192, 195, 204, 206, 233, 244, 246, 376, 452, 868
Brahmapāla, 184
Brahmaputra valley, the, 381, 448, 485, 720, 722
Brahuis, the, 23
Braithwaite, Colonel, 676
Brajabhāshā, 400, 575
Brajabhūmi (Jumnā valley), 574
Brasyer, Captain, 769
Brayne, F. L., 931
Brazil, 624
Brezhnev, Leonid, 1026
Bṛibu, 33
Bright, John, 880
Bṛihaddevatā, the, 36
Bṛihadratha, 102, 103
Bṛihaspati, 200
Bṛihaspatimitra, 110
Bṛihatphalāyanas, the, 164
Brindāvan, 397
Brindāvan Dās, 575
British Administration up to the Mutiny, 777–98; Central, 777–83; Provincial, 783–92
—— Dominions, 797, 798
British Government, the (Home Government), 806–20 *passim; see also* Part III, Book II, Modern India, 823 *sqq.*
British Museum, 229
Broach, 130, 135, 150, 171, 172, 344, 568, 629, 669, 670, 697
Broadfoot, Lieut. W., 749

Broadfoot, Major, 735, 750
Brown, Percy, 577, 593
Brydon, Dr., 750
Budāūn, 275, 278
Buddewal, 736
Buddha, Gautama, 56, 57, 58, 80, 82–4, 86, 89, 133, 194, 372
Buddhism, 82–5, 187, 194–5, 1027; the scriptures of, 82–5, 135; *Hīnayāna* and *Mahāyāna*, 133
——patronised by: Aśoka, 97, 98, 99, 100, 103, 133; distant countries, 203–5, 209; the Greeks, 111, 135; Harsha, 151–2; Kanishka, 115–16; the Mauryas, 132; the Pālas, 160; the Śailendras, 212; *see also* Buddha Gautama
Buddhist art, 212, 214, 224–7, 228, 230, 233, 235, 246, 247, 503, 591
Budha Gupta, 144, 146, 174
Bughrā Khān, 282, 283, 284
Bühler, J. G., 200
Buhlūl Khān Lodī, 331, 332, 342, 428
Bukhārā, 402, 468, 488, 742, 823, 825
Bukka I, 182, 360
Bukka II, 361
Buland Darwāza, the, 581
Bulandshahr district, 139
Bulganin, N. A., 1024–5
Bundelās, the, 464, 491
Bundelkhand, 178, 269, 271, 343, 426, 443, 491, 695, 699, 720, 772, 928
Bundelkhand University, 963
Bundi, 697, 699, 720
Buner, 447
Buran (Pindarī), 717, 718
Burdwān, 458, 563, 628, 632, 662
Burgess, Dr., 412
Burhān-i-Ma'āsir, the, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 366
Burhān Nizām Shāh, 358, 365
Burhānpur, 346, 434, 449, 498, 563, 564, 565, 695
Burhan-ud-din, 501
Burke, Edmund, 682, 685, 780
Burma, 3, 6, 210, 369, 485, 671, 722, 723–8, 831–3, 898, 901, 905, 910, 932, 950, 951, 976, 1025
Burmese Wars, 723–8, 741, 767, 857
Burnes, Sir Alexander, 745, 747, 749, 753
Burnes, Charles, 749
Burney, Major Henry, 725
Burr, Colonel, 702
Bushire, 742
Bussorah, 280
Bussy, Marquis de, 541, 642, 645, 658, 659, 709
Butler, Sir Harcourt, 913, 943
Butwal, 715
Buxār, 664, 665, 741

Cabinet Mission, 978–9, 982, 983
Cabral, Pedro, 623
Cāchār, 725, 758
Caillaud, Colonel John, 663
Cairo, 402, 710
Calcutta, 224, 633, 634, 635, 647–54 *passim*, 658, 661, 662, 663, 669, 688, 699, 706, 725, 726, 748, 761, 763, 767, 778, 783–98, *passim*, 810, 815, 818, 819, 853–4, 861, 879–83 *passim*, 887, 888, 901, 914, 917, 919, 920, 948, 968, 970, 972, 979, 1021
—— University, 810, 812, 815, 874, 881, 943, 947
Calicut, 369, 568, 623, 624
California, gold in, 858
Caliphs, *see* Khalifāhs, the
Callaghan, James, 1024
Camac, General Jacob, 670
Cambay, 344, 346, 427, 568
Cambodia, 206, 210, 233, 241
Campbell, Sir Archibald, 724, 725
Campbell, Sir Colin, 770, 771, 772, 820
Canada, 878, 905
Canals, irrigation, 864, 887, 928
Canning, Captain, 723
Canning, Lord, 761, 767, 772, 773, 775, 813, 844
Cape Colony, 736
Cape of Good Hope, 346, 623
Carey, William, 810, 811
Carnatic, the, 510, 517, 635, 637–46, 647, 648, 653, 658–61, 668, 674, 675, 676, 678, 682–3, 711–12, 713, 720, 757, 762, 833
—— Wars, 637–46, 658–61
Caron, François, 635
Carpenter, Dr., 398
Carter, Jimmy, 1023, 1024
Cartier, John, 570, 667
Cartridges, greased, 768
Caspian Sea, 203, 204, 744
Cāssimbāzār, 630, 648, 649, 724, 800
Cassino, Monte, 950
Caste sytem, 44, 74, 124, 125, 188, 189, 807
Castlereagh, Lord, 694, 697, 699
Catherine of Braganza, 626, 629
Catholic Emancipation Act, 813
Caucasus, the, 380
Cavagnari, Sir L., 828
Cavas, Aśokan, 230; Chaitya, 231

Cawnpore, 531, 689, 769, 770, 772, 917, 930, 937
Celebes, 212, 233
Census of 1961, Indian, 6
Central Advisory Board, 962, 965
Central Asia, 172, 202, 204, 272, 276, 284, 316, 418, 424, 524, 566, 716, 800, 823, 825, 826, 891, 895
Central Banking Enquiry Committee, 930
Central Hindu College, Benares, 876
Central India, 287, 290, 431, 441, 448, 500, 519, 564, 626, 670, 716, 719–21, 769, 772, 862
Central Provinces, 438, 441, 862, 906, 910, 928, 931, 937, 984, 986, 991
Ceylon, 76, 87, 98, 110, 129, 133, 138, 141, 165, 167, 181, 214, 236, 361, 624, 625
——, Chronicles of, 56, 58–9, 60, 83, 85, 93
Chābāspur, 565
Chach, 172
Chagātaī, 315, 316, 418
Chāhelgān, the, 280
Chain of Justice, Jahāngīr's, 456, 462
Chait Singh (of Benāres), 686–7, 689, 757
Chaitanya, 379, 396, 397, 398, 575–6, 870
Chaitanya Bhāgavata, the, 575
Chaitanya Mangal, the, 575, 576
Chaitanyacharitāmitra, the, 397, 575
Chaitya caves, 230–1
Chākan fort, 504
Chakdarra, 890
Chakks, the, 348
Chakrapāṇi, 160
Chakrāyudha, 157, 161, 169
Chalukyas, 147, 150, 151, 161, 165–8, 169, 170, 172, 180, 181, 185, 198, 200, 359; genealogical tables, 251, 252, 254
Chambal, river, 476, 539, 699, 701, 718, 759
Chamber of Princes, the, 912, 982, 983
Chamberlain, Neville, 771
Chamdo, 896
Champā (Indo-China), 57, 72, 76, 207, 212
Chāmpāner (Muhammadābād), 346, 401, 427
Champat Rāi, 491
Champion, Colonel Alexander, 684
Chāmunda Ray, 244
Chāṇakya, *see* Kautilya
Chānd Bibi, 358, 449
Chānd Khān (of Gujarāt), 344
Chanda Pradyota Mahāsena, *see* Pradyota (of Avanti)
Chanda Sāhib, 639, 642, 644
Chaṇḍakauśika, the, 162
Chāṇḍāla caste, 189
Chandellas, the, 162, 173, 178, 246, 269
Chanderī, 295, 333, 344, 421, 422
Chandernagore, 635, 653, 658, 709, 799, 818
Chandī Devī, 576
Chandīdās, 400
Chandī-mangal, the, 573
Chandra, 139, 140
Chandradeva, 178
Chandragiri, 367, 630
Chandra Gupta I, 137–8
Chandra Gupta II, Vikramāditya, 113, 141–3, 164–5, 185, 190, 193, 200
Chandragupta Maurya I, 60, 61, 66, 69, 80, 91–4, 95, 104–6, 118, 119, 121, 132, 133, 135, 137
Chandrāpīḍa, 154
Chandra Sena Jādav, 536
Chandras, the, 158
Chandrashekar Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, 963
Chandravarman, 139, 140
Chandravarmankot, 139
Chandwār, 271, 332
Changama, 675
Chāpas, the, 167, 172
Charaka, 135
Charles II, 626, 629, 630, 633
Charnock, Job, 632
Charter Act, 781, 782, 794, 797, 799, 809, 811, 813, 847, 848, 877
Chashṭana, 113
Chatfield Committee, 923
Chatter Singh, 739, 740
Chaudhury, Gen. J. N., 986
Chauhans, the, 178, 179, 269, 270
Chaul, 346, 510, 568, 624
Chaulukyas, the, 162. *See also* Chalukyas
Chaunsa, 431
Chaurāsī Vaishnava ki vārta, the, 575
Chauri Chaurā, 972
Chauth, 497, 512, 517, 532, 537, 541, 647, 674, 703
Chavan, Y. B., 990, 1017
Chavotaka, 172
Chedis, the, 54, 159, 162, 179
Chelmsford, Lord, 903, 912, 916
Chenāb, river, 451; and canal, 864
Chepauk, 682
Cherry, G. F., 713
Chess, 127

Chhamb, 1014
Chhatrapati, 510, 514
Chhatrasāl Bundelā, 491, 538
Chicacole, 645
Chicago, 874
Chidambaram, 943
Chilāta, 133
Child, Sir Josiah, 631
Child marriage, 370, 940
Chiliānwālā, 739, 740
Chin Qilīch Khān, *see* Nizām-ul-mulk Āsaf Jāh
China, 129, 133, 150, 151, 153, 154, 169, 189, 190, 191, 204, 205, 206, 207, 212, 229, 309, 314, 316, 336, 360, 368, 383, 390, 393, 591, 715, 767, 800, 816, 832, 860, 895, 896, 898, 1006–7, 1009, 1014
Chinese Turkestān, 419
Chinghīz Khān, 204, 276, 418, 424
Chingleput, 361, 659
Chins, the, 833
Chinsurā, 628, 662, 818
Chintāmoni, C. Y., 908
Chirol, Sir Valentine, 876, 917
Chiteldrug, 707
Chitor, 294, 295, 343, 346, 427, 434, 442, 443, 496
Chitral, 830, 890
Chittāgong, 337, 486, 563, 568, 662 723, 724, 866, 974
Chitu (Pindarī), 717, 718
Chodas, 96
Cholas, the, 110, 165, 170, 180, 181 182, 186, 192, 198, 214, 241, 242, 243, 375; genealogical table, 256
Chota Nāgpur, 548, 765, 914
Chotā Sonā Masjid, the, 411
Christianity, 134, 372, 451, 452, 454, 463, 465, 516, 764, 808, 810, 813, 815, 874, 906
Chryse, the Golden Land, 205
Chrysostom, Dion, 135
Chuluka, Brahmadeva's, 167
Chumbi valley, 896
Chunār, 341, 426, 429, 430, 486, 702
Churaman Jāt, 488, 535
Chutī Khān, 401
Chutiyas, the, 381
Chuṭu-Śātakarnis (Chutukulānanda), the, 164–5, 167
Cis-Sutlej States (Sikhs), the, 730, 731, 732, 761
Civil Defence Corps, 950
Civil Disobedience, 970–5, 976
Civil Service of India, *see* Indian Civil Service, the
Clark, Gen. Mark, 950
Claudius, 114
Clavering, Sir John, 778, 779, 780
Clive, Robert, 541, 570, 634, 643, 644, 646, 652, 653, 654, 656, 657, 658, 659, 661, 662, 665, 666, 667, 720, 783
Clyde, Lord, *see* Campbell, Sir Colin
Coal Mines (Taking over of Management) ordinance, 1020
Cochin, 110, 568, 624, 985, 991
Cochin China, 210, 582, 832
Cockburn, Colonel William, 670
Coimbatore, 677, 680, 707, 930
Coinage, *see* Currency
Colbert, Jean-Baptiste, 625, 635
Cole outbreak, the, 765
Colgong, 340
Collector, the, 765, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795
Colombo Conference, 1007
Colony Canals, Punjab, 864
Columbia University, 939
Colvin, John, 747, 748
Combermere, Lord, 726
Comilla, 980
Commander-in-Chief, the, 842, 843, 864, 865, 921–2
Commissioner, the, 785, 793
Committee of Secrecy, 777, 780
Committee on Differentiation of curricula between Boys and Girls, 965
Commonwealth, the, 6, 954, 960, 981, 982, 991
Commonwealth Relations Conference (1945), 952
Communal Award, 974
Communications and Public Works, 926–8
Communists, 938
Comorin, Cape, 205, 297, 628, 720, 722
Conciliation Boards, 957
Conference of the Colombo Powers, (1954), 952, 1023
Conjeeveram (Kāñchī), 110, 140, 164, 165, 167, 191, 198, 239, 355, 361, 377, 659
Constantinople, 169, 402, 418, 488, 577, 678, 705
Constituent Assembly, 979, 980, 981, 991
Constitution, Indian, 991–1005
Conti, Nicolo de, 361, 368
Cooch Bihār, 341, 382, 485, 488, 870, 985
Coomāraswāmy, Dr. A. K., 948
Co-operative Movement, the, 931–2, 959-60
Coorg, 660, 676, 758, 835, 991
Cote, Sir Eyre, 660, 667, 677
Copper Age, 13

Cornwallis, Lord, 570, 671, 673, 678, 679, 680, 681, 683, 689, 698, 699, 704, 784–93 *passim*, 795, 802, 818
Cornwallis Code, 792
Coromandel Coast, 297, 318, 565, 566, 626, 627, 630, 635, 800, 999
Coronation Durbar, Delhi, 1911, 914
Cosijura, Raja of, 789
Cosmas Indikolpeustes, 146
Cotton, Sir Henry, 879
Cotton, Sir Willoughby, 747, 748
Cotton industry, 856, 888, 916
Council of India, *see* India Council
Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, 964
Council of State, 912
Couper, Sir George, 763
Court of Directors, 810, 840, 841, 842
Covenanted Civil Service, *see* Indian Civil Services
Cowell, Prof., 576, 842
Cox, Captain, 723
Craig, Sir James, 742
Crewe, Lord, 907
Crimean War, 767, 823
Cripps, Sir Stafford, 976
Cromer, Lord, 775,
Cromwell, Oliver, 627, 630, 733
Crown, India under the, 833, 836, 837, 838, 840–6, 847, 859, 867
Cultural expansion in Ancient India, 202–16, 241
—— Renaissance, the, 956–63
Cunningham, J. D., 729, 732, 735, 737
Currency: in Maurya era, 130; in Gupta era, 192; in Tughluq era, 314; 325; in Vijayanagar Empire, 369; in Mughal era, 567; of East India Company, 635; the South India Pagoda, 683; in Modern India, 857–8
Currie, Sir Frederick, 738, 739
Curtius, Quintus, 78, 127, 132
Curzon, Lord, 854, 855, 862, 866, 890–901 *passim*, 912, 914, 921, 928, 934, 946, 967, 968
Cutch, 172, 320, 322, 346, 479, 984, 991
Cuttack, 696
Cyrus, 61
Czechoslovakia, 953

Dabhol, 568
Dabo, 756
Dacca, 478, 485, 486, 531, 557, 563, 565, 641, 724, 790, 791, 793, 800, 866, 879; University, 943, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017
Dādāji Khonddev, 505
Dadar, 479
Dadda II, 150
Dadhikarna, 133
Daflas, the, 898
Dāgh, 557
Dāgoba, the, 230–1
Dāhir (Dāhar), 172
Dahnaj, 172
Dal Khalsa, the, 535
Dalāi Lama, 895–6, 1006
Dalā'il-i-Firuz Shāhī, the, 321
Dalewāl, 535
Dalhousie, Lord, 702, 714, 739, 740, 758, 760, 761, 762, 763, 765, 766, 767, 814, 833, 842, 844, 858, 887
Dalip Singh, 734, 737, 740
Dalmau, 329
Dāmājī Gāikwār, 540
Damān, 510, 512, 624
Damana, 140
Damila, 133
Dāmodara Gupta, 155
Damyak, 272
Dānādhyaksha, the, 511
Dānasāgara, the, 180
Dandanāyaka, the, 376
Dandi, 974
Daṇḍin, 201
Dane, Sir Louis, 892
Danes, the, 625, 799, 818
Dāniyāl, 449
Dantidurga, 158, 169
Dār-ul-Baqa, the, 572
Dār-ul-harb, the, 489
Dār-ul-Islām, 489
Dār-ul-Shafā, the, 325
Dārā Shukoh, 457, 461, 467, 470, 471, 473–80, 494, 501, 572, 574, 593
Daraporam, 707
Dārbhangā, 532
Dardanelles, Treaty of the, 730,
Dargai, 890
Darius, 61, 66
Dariyā Khān (of Sambhal), 332, 333
Dariyā Khān Lohānī, 334
Dārogā, the, 550, 792
Darrang, 486
Darśaka, 58
Daryā Khān, 326
Dās, Desabandhu C. R. 972
Dās, Sarat Chandra, 896
Dasabodhu, the, 504
Daśaratha, 86, 87, 102, 133
Dāsas, the, 25, 26, 27, 31
Dastaks, the, 570, 801
Dāstān-i-Amir Hamzah, the, 591
Dasyus, the, 26, 31, 50
Datta, Akshaykumār, 869

Datta, Aswini Kumar, 967
Dattājī Sindhia, 542
Dāūd (of Bengal), 445, 446
Dāūd (of Khāndesh), 349
Dāūd Khān (of Gujarāt), 345
Dāūd Khān Bahmanī, 351, 485
Daulat Khān (governor of Qandahār), 466
Daulat Khān Lodī, 330, 334, 419, 420
Daulat Rāo Sindhia, 562, 673, 674, 691, 692, 693, 694, 700, 701, 709, 759
Daulatābād (Devagiri), 182, 290, 295, 296, 297, 304, 312–13, 317, 318, 322, 350, 353, 358, 413, 468, 469, 470, 471, 499, 501, 541
Davāka, 140
Dāwar Bakhsh, Prince, 463, 464
Day, Francis, 630
Dayānanda Anglo-Vedic College, 874
Dayānanda Saraswatī Svāmī, 873, 874
De Laet, J., 480
Debal, 171, 172
Deçaen, General, 710
Deccan, the, 130, 134, 137, 140, 164–70, 178, 179, 182, 186, 189, 195, 198, 243, 290, 295, 298, 312, 315, 317, 318, 322, 346, 365, 366, 367, 376, 397, 405, 414, 448, 449, 460, 461, 463, 465, 479, 484, 522, 529, 530, 531, 536, 537, 541, 555, 565, 569, 576, 630, 635, 637, 638, 658, 678, 681, 695, 717, 720, 766, 928, 984; Bahmanī, kingdom of, 349–56, 599; Five Sulānates of, 357–9; Shāh Jahān and, 468–74; Aurangzeb and, 473, 474, 498–500, 501, 505–10, 516–19; French & English in, 642–7
Deccan Education Society, 872, 877, 938
Deede Meer, 765
Dehra Dun, 863, 923, 950
Deimachos, 94
Dela Haye, Admiral, 635
Delhi, 179, 182, 267–415 *passim*, 420, 421, 422, 426, 438, 439, 446, 454, 477, 478, 480, 487, 493, 494, 496, 502, 504, 520, 521, 522, 525–73 *passim*, 578, 584, 586, 647, 650, 651, 664, 672, 681, 695, 698, 720, 721, 728, 730, 736, 762, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 773, 914, 919, 978, 981, 991
Delhi Agreement, 1016
—— Pact, 684
—— Sultānate, 267, *sqq.*, 419
—— University, 943
Demetrios the Fair, 104
Demetrios, Prince (of Bactria), 108, 111, 134
Demonetisation, 1022
Denmark, 949
Deogāon, Treaty of, 695
Deogarh, 233, 236
Deorāi, 479, 484
Depressed Classes, the, 941–2, 975
Derā Ghāzi, Khan, 890
Deśa, the, 188
Desai, Morarji, 1023
Deshmukh, Durgabai, 965
Deshmukhs, the Marātha, 168
Deva Gupta, 148, 154
Devadatta, 58, 82, 89
Devadhar, G. K., 941
Devagiri, *see* Daulatābād
Devalā Devī, 293, 296
Devānanṁpiya Piyadasi (Aśoka), 95 117, 132
Devānaṁpiya Tissa, 98
Devapāla (of Bengal), 212
Devapāla (Pāla), 157
Devarāshtra, 140
Deva Rāya I, 361
Deva Rāya II, 361, 395
Devas, the, 99, 100
Devavarman, 102
Devī, 451
Devī Chandra Guptam, the, 200
Dhābādes, the, 539
Dhaki Khasiyas, the, 189
Dhana Nanda, 60, 61
Dhanāji Jādava, 517, 536
Dhanañjaya, 140
Dhanga, 178
Dhār, 295, 312, 329, 345, 412, 539
Dhar, D. P., 1013
Dhārā, 191
Dharasena IV, 153
Dharma, 90, 96, 97, 99, 121
Dharmāditya, 156
Dharmamalla (of Nepāl), 383
Dharmapāla, King, 157, 160, 161, 169, 179
Dharmapāla, missionary, 160
Dharmaśāstras, the, 191
Dharmāt, 475, 146, 477
Dhāṭṛi, 36, 79
Dhauli, 96
Dhīmāna, 160
Dholpur, 333, 536, 577
Dhoyī, 180
Dhṛitarāshṭra Vaichitravīrya, 88
Dhruva (Rāshtrakūṭa), 161, 169, 170
Dhruva Dhārāvarsha, 161
Dhruvabhaṭa, 150, 153

Dhruvadevī, 141
Diarchy, 117, 904, 905, 910
Diaz, Bartholomew, 623
Diddā, 155, 162
Diego Garcia, 1017
Dig, 698
Digambaras, the, 81, 195
Dignāgācharya, 142, 194, 200
Dihang valley, 898
Dilāvarā, 238
Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī (of Mālwa), 329, 432, 348
Dilāwar Khān Lodī, 334, 419
Dilīr Khān, 507, 510
Dilke, Sir Charles, 840
Dilras Bānu Begam, 470
Dilwār 'Ālī Khān, 530
Dināpore, 767
Dindigul, 680
Din-i-Ilāhi, the, 452, 453
Diodoros, 122
Diodotos I, 104
Dipālpūr, 292, 329
Direct Action, 979, 980
Dirom, Major, 708
Disang, river, 381
Disraeli, Benjamin, 827, 828
Diu, 346, 427, 430, 438, 624
Divākara, 153
Divodāsa, 26, 27
Divvoka, 159
Diwān, the, 550, 556
Diwān-i-'Am, the, 481, 581, 586
Diwān-i-Amīr Kohi, the, 385
Diwān-i-'Arz, the 315, 385
Diwān-i-Bandagān, the, 385
Diwān-i-Insha, the, 385
Diwān-i-Istihqāq, the, 385
Diwān-i-Khairāit, the, 325
Diwān-i-Khās, the, 481, 526, 581, 586
Diwān-i-Mustakhraj, the, 385
Diwān-i-Qazā-i-Mamālik, the, 385
Diwān-i-Risālat, the, 385
Diwān-i-Riyāsat, the, 301
Diwānī of Bengal, the, 783, 785, 788, 800
Diwānī Adalat, the, 788
Dixon, Sir Owen, 988
Doabs, the, 157, 160, 162, 169, 178, 280, 281, 311, 312, 327, 329, 331, 332, 362, 377, 392, 421, 442, 541, 543, 713, 714, 796
Doctrine of Lapse, the, 702, 760, 761, 763, 765
Dohās, the, 400
Dolmens, 12
Dominion Status, 906, 907, 909, 970, 973, 976, 981
Donābew, 724, 925
Dorasamudra (Hablēbid), 181, 245, 296, 297, 298, 312, 360
Dorjieff (Russian Buddhist), 895
Dost 'Ālī, Nawāb, 638, 642
Dost Muhammad, 743–4, 745, 746, 747,748, 749, 753, 773, 824
Dourah, *or* Dauhrūā, 426
Dow, Colonel Alexander, 480, 564
Drake, Sir Francis, 628
Drake, Roger, 649
Drama, Indian, 946, 948
Draupadi, 89, 240
Dravidians, the, 13, 14, 23, 110, 157, 168, 202; their art, 237–45
Droṇa, 89, 125, 207
Druhyus, the, 25, 26
Dual Government, Clive's, 783
Du Chemin (French commander), 676
Dudpatli, 724
Duff, Alexander, 812
Duff, James Grant, 507, 512, 514, 546, 558, 673, 693, 695
Dufferin, Lord, 845, 849, 881, 883, 912
Dumas, Benoît (governor of Pondicherry), 636
Duncan, Jonathan, 810
Dundas, Henry, 679, 694, 742, 780
Dundee, 935
Dundu Pant, *see* Nānā Sāheb
Dungarpur, 720
Dupleix, Marquis, 636, 639–46 *passim*, 653, 660, 799
Durand, Sir Mortimer, 830
Durgā, 78
Durgādās, 495, 496, 497, 533
Durgapur, 955
Durgāvatī, 441
Durjan Sal, 726
Durlabh, Rāi, 653, 654, 662
Durlabhavardhana, 154
Durrānīs, the, 527, 542, 545, 741–2
Durr-i-Durrān, the, 527
Duryodhana, 89
Dutch, the, 214, 559, 565, 566, 569, 625–8, 629, 635, 636, 662, 709, 799, 800, 818
Dutt, Pandit Guru, 873
Dutta, Narendranāth (Svāmī Vivekānanda) 874–5, 876
Dutta, Toru, 946
Dvairajya, 117
Dwaraka (or Dvaraka) 89, 196
Dyaus, 36
Dyer, General, 971

Earth Goddess, the, 36, 37, 46
East Bengal, 1011, 1012
East Germany, 953
East India College, Haileybury, 848

East India Company, the, 529, 532, 569, 570, 625, 628–35, 741–53, 757–64, 832, 833, 835, 837, 838, 839, 847, 848, 857, 859, 864, 865, 878, 886
East Indies, the, 627
East Pakistan, 1010, 1028
East Punjab, 981, 991
Eastern Economist, 960–1
Eastern Gangas, the, 181
Ecbatana, 122
Economic conditions: in the Vedic Age, 32–4; Aryan, 45; in Magadhan Empire, 57, 76, 77; in Maurya Empire, 128–31; in Gupta era, 190–2; in Vijayanagar Empire, 368, 369; in Turko-Afghān era, 389–92; in Mughal era, 562–70; in Modern India, 799–805, 924–38, 954–61
Economic Programme, 20-point, 1003–4
Education: Ancient Indian, 47, 62, 191; Muslim, 402–3; Mughul, 571–2; English, 806–7, 810–15; Modern, 851, 867, 874, 877, 882, 884, 942–8, 961–6
Educational Congress, 885
Edward VIII (as Prince of Wales), 972
Edwardes, Sir Herbert, 739, 741, 746, 774
Egerton, Colonel, 670
Egypt, 129, 136, 202, 316, 322, 343, 346, 384, 388, 413, 414, 692, 709, 949, 1029
Ekanāth, 504
El Edroos, Gen., 986
Elara, 110
Elephanta caves, the, 244
Elizabetha I, Queen, 451, 628
Ellenborough, Lord, 740, 750, 751–3, 755, 756, 759, 884
Ellichpur, 296
Ellis, William, 663
Ellora, 169, 244
Ellore, 645
Elphinstone, Lord, 769
Elphinstone, Mountstuart, 499, 527, 697, 700, 701, 720, 795, 796
Elphinstone, General W. G. K., 748, 749, 750
Employees Provident Fund, 1022
Employees, State Insurance Act, 1022
Empress of India, title of, 837
Enfield rifle, the, 768
England, General, 751
English Company of Merchants, *see* East India Company
English language, 962, 996
Enlistment Act, General Service, 767
Eran, 139, 140, 144
Eraṇḍapalla, 140
Erakine, William, 423, 425, 435
Etāwah, 330, 332, 333, 536
Eudemos, 91, 105
Eudoxus of Cyzicus, 130
Euergetes II, 129
Eukratides, 111
Europe, 203, 335, 390, 405, 418, 463, 481, 565, 568, 627, 678, 709, 810, 811, 823, 828, 858, 859, 949, 960. *See also* Europeans
Europeans, 235, 490, 507, 513, 532, 548, 552, 559, 560, 561, 563, 566, 569, 589, 623–36, 641, 664, 672, 682, 689, 693, 695, 696, 697, 703, 704, 710, 713, 733, 734, 735, 737, 744, 766, 767, 768, 771, 776, 799, 800, 802, 803, 804, 807, 809, 816, 820, 876, 878, 880, 886, 887, 888, 892, 933, 934
Euthymedia, 111
Eyre, Sir Charles, 632
Eyre, Major Vincent, 769

Fa-Hien, 142–3, 152, 185, 189, 190, 194, 219
Factory legislation, 860, 936–9, 956–7
Faizābād, 688
Faizī (the poet), 450, 451, 573
Faizī Sarhindī, 573
Faizullā Khān (of Rāmpura), 685, 757
Fakhr-ud-dīn (*Kotwāl* of Delhi), 282
Fakhr-ud-dīn 'Abdul 'Aziz Kufi, 270
Fakhr-ud-dīn Mubārak Shāh, 317, 335, 336
Fakhr-ud-dīn Muhammad Jauna Khān, 307, 308, 309
Famine Enquiry Commission, 958
Famines, 354, 465–6, 481, 564–5, 570, 857, 860–2, 928, 932, 958
Farghāna, 419
Farid, *see* Sher Shāh
Farid, Shiakh (of Bukhārā), 565
Faridpur (Bengal), 765
Farquhar, Dr., 398
Farakka Agreement, 1018
Farrukh Beg, 592
Farrukhnagar, 536
Farrukhsiyar, 521, 524, 530, 537, 634, 801
Fatāwa-i-Ālamgīrī, the, 501, 552
Fateh Khān, 742, 743
Fatehābād, 324
Fatehgarh, 689
Fath Khān (of Ahmadnagar), 468, 460
Fath Khān (son of Fīrūz Shāh), 326
Fath Shāh Jalāl-ud-din, 338
Fathbād, 577

Fathpur Sīkrī, 445, 451, 453, 563, 566, 571, 579, 581, 591
Fathullāh Imād Shāh, 357
Fatūhāt-i-'Ālamgīrī, the, 574
Fatūhāt-i-Firūz Shāhī, the, 402
Faujdār, the, 551, 789
Faujdārī Adalat, the, 788
Fazalkah, 317
Female Sepoys, 674*n*[1]
Ferazee disturbances, the, 765
Fergusson, J., 243, 372, 403, 579
Fergusson College, Poona, 877
Ferishta, 270, 276, 278, 279, 302, 307, 310, 315, 330, 343, 350, 351, 353, 357, 366, 389
Ferozepore (Fīrūzpur), 317, 324, 735, 747, 752
Feroze Shāh (Fīrūzshuhur), 735, 736
Financial administration: (1858–1905), 855–7; (1096–37), 924–7; (1938–48), 958
Finch, W., 582
Firman Ali, 1013
Fīrūz Khān (son of Selim Shāh), 436
Fīrūz Shāh, 766
Fīrūz Shāh (son of Rajab), 318–27; successors of, 327–9
Fīrūz Shāh Bahmanī, 348, 351, 352, 371, 385
Fīrūz Shāh Khaljī, 286, 288, 289, 290, 302, 402
Fīrūz Shāh Tughluq, 309, 332, 334, 336, 341, 342, 387, 391, 392, 402, 403
Fīrūzābād (Pāndua), 320, 324, 328, 335, 336, 338, 402, 410
Fīrūzhuhur, *see* Feroze Shāh
Fiscal Changes (1906–37), 935
Fisher, H.A.L., 917
Fitch, Ralph, 563
Five Principles (*Pancha Sheel*,) 1006
Florence, 950
Food: in Vedic times, 29, 30; in Gupta era, 192; in Vijayanagar Empire, 369
Food Corporation of India, 958
Forde, Colonel, 659
Foreign immigrants in Gupta era, 188, 189
Foreign relations, 1023–9
Forest Service, Indian, 863, 918
Formulī tribes, the, 334
Forrest, Sir George W., 687
Fort St. David, 637, 640, 658
Fort St. George, 630
Fort William, 632, 649, 713
Forth, Dr., 648
'Forward Bloc', 976
Foster, Sir William, 470
Fowler, Sir Henry, 857, 858
Fox, Charles James, 780
France, 949
Francis, Sir Philip, 778, 780
Fraser, Lovat, 899
France, 953
Free trade, 856
French, the, 207, 483, 625, 627, 637–41 *passim*, 652, 653, 654, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 669, 670, 671, 676, 677, 678–982 *passim*, 686, 692, 695, 704, 705, 708–10, 721, 723, 730, 742, 753, 799, 818, 831, 863, 877, 893
French East India Company, 634–6
Frere, Sir Bartle, 842
Fresco-paintings, 235–6
Fryer, John, 512
Fullarton, Colonel William, 677
Fulta, 651, 652
Fu-nan, 207, 210, 212, 214
Fytche, General, 728
Fyzullāpur, 535

Gadgil, N. V., 984
Gāhadavālas, the, 178, 179, 180, 269; genealogical table, 250
Gajapati Pratāparudra, 363
Gajendragadkar, P. B., 1022
Gakkars, the, 431
Ganapati (Kākatīya), 182, 298
Ganapati Nāga, 139
Gaṇḍā, 178
Gandamak, Treaty of, 828, 829
Gandhāra, 33, 54, 61–2, 95, 107, 133, 146
—— sculpture, 227–33
Gandhi, Indira, 966, 1010, 1013, 1014, 1016, 1023, 1026, 1027, 1028
Gāndhi, Mahātmā, 907, 908, 935, 942, 970, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 983
Gāndhī-Irwin, Pact, the, 974
Ganesh, Rājā, 337–8
Gangā, Bāī, 668
Gangādāsa Protāpa Vilāsa, the, 401
Gangādhar, 401
Gangādhar Shāstrī, 700
Gangaikonda-cholapuram, 243
Gangas, the, 165, 182, 195, 244, 377
——, Eastern, 181
Ganges river and valley, 132, 170, 178, 181, 192, 194, 205, 268, 311, 377, 422, 431, 626, 685, 697, 714, 732, 769, 816, 887
Gangetic Doāb, the, 15-, 160, 162, 169, 280, 281, 311, 312, 327, 329, 331, 332, 392, 421, 442, 541, 543, 713, 714, 796

Gāngeyadeva, 159, 174, 178
Gangū, 350
Ganj, 574
Gañjām, 150, 151, 156
Garah Katanga, 441
Gardner, General, 715
Garga, 135
Garga Yavanas, the, *see* Muslims
Garhgāon, 485
Garhwāl Hills, 478, 716
Gartok, 896
Garuḍa column, 133, 136
Garuḍadhvaja, 231
Gauḍas, the, 145, 148, 149, 150, 154, 155, 156, 158, 161, 169, 179
Gauhāti, 485
Gaur, 272, 338, 339, 397, 411, 430, 445
Gautamī Balaśrī, 126
Gautamīputra Śātakarni, 109, 113, 118, 125, 137, 164, 168, 182
Gāwilgarh, 695, 697
Gawshpur, 718
Gayā, 509
Gemelli-Careri, G. F., 502
General Society, *see* East India Company
Geneva Trade Conference, 961
Genoa, 623
Geological Survey of India, 947
George III, King, 780
George V, King, 914
German Democratic Republic, 953
Germany, 863, 886, 891, 893, 894, 943, 949, 977
Ghafur Khān, 720
Ghaghar, river, 324, 381
Ghairwajh, the, 325
Ghālib Khān, 329
Ghasiti Begam, 647, 648, 649
Ghats, Western, 505
Ghāzī, title of, 484
Ghāzī Malik, 292, 305. *See also* Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq
Ghāzī-ud-dīn Fīrūz Jang, 530
Ghāzī-ud-dīn Imād-ul-mulk, 522
Ghāzīpur, 445, 699, 718
Ghaznavids, the, 170, 174, 180, 267, 268, 269, 270, 386
Ghaznī, 172, 173, 269, 270, 272, 282, 525, 623, 748, 751, 752
——, Sultāns of, 162, 173, 267–8, 273, 275
Ghaznī Khān, 349
Ghiyās Beg, 573, 574
Ghiyās-ud-dīn (of Mālwa), 343
Ghiyās-ud-dīn 'A'zam Shāh, 336
Ghiyā-sud-dīn Bahādur Shāh, 308, 335
Ghiyās-ud-dīn Bahmanī, 351
Ghiyās-ud-dīn Balban, *see* Balban
Ghiyās-ud-dīn Mahmūd (of Ghūr), 271*n*[1]
Ghiyās-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh (Shāhi), 341
Ghiyās-ud-dīn Muhammad (of Ghūr), 269, 272
Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq, 292, 305, 306–9, 316, 319, 329, 387, 401, 402
Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq II, 327, 335,
Ghiyāspur, 335
Ghizalī, 573
Ghizālīs, the, 749
Ghosh, Arabinda, 967
Ghosh, Lālmohan, 880
Ghoshā, 30
Ghulām Husain, 522, 525, 531, 532, 654
Ghūr, 271, 272, 623; Sultāns of, 268–72
Ghūzak, 173
Ghuzz Turkmāns, the, 269
Gidumal, Dayārām, 941
Gilbert, Sir Walter, 740
Gilgit, 830
Gillespie, General Sir R. R., 715
Giriā, 532, 664
Girivaraja, 57, 59, 78, 86, 89
Girpār, 96, 175, 195
Giscard D'Estaing, Valery, 954
Gīta-Govinda, the, 180, 201
Gladstone, W. E. 826, 827, 828, 829
Gladwin, Francis, 462
Glaukanikoi, the, 62
Goa, 354, 364, 438, 451, 510, 567, 568, 624, 625, 626, 634
Goālpārā ,336, 485
Godāvarī, river, 168, 169, 181, 377, 449
Godāvari-Krishṇa Doāb, 377
Goddard, Colonel, 670
Godeheu, M., 644, 658
Godolphin, Earl of, 633
Godwin, General Sir H. T., 727, 767
Gogra, river, 422, 423, 427
Gogundā, 443
Gohad, 697, 699; Rānā of, 670
Gokarna, 157
Gokhale, General, 702
Gokhale, Gopal Krishna, 877, 899 903, 917, 938, 944, 967, 968, 969
Gokla (of Tilpat), 490
Golāb Singh, 737
Goldsmith, Sir Frederick, 902
Golkundā, 363, 365, 367, 379, 395, 403, 438, 448, 450, 468, 469, 472, 473, 479, 484, 488, 498, 499, 510, 630, 635
——, Sultānate of, 359

Gollas (the White Hun), 146
Gomata, image of, 244
Gombroon, 626
Gondāpur, 697
Gondophernes, 112
Gonds, the, 464
Gondwāna, 349, 438, 441, 442, 537
Gooty, 707
Gopachandra, 156
Gopāla I, 157, 184
Gopāla II, 158
Gopāla III, 159
Gopālgir, 281
Gopināth, 506
Gopināthpur inscription, 377
Gopuram, the, 243
Gora (Rājput), 294
Gorakhpur, 715, 972
Gordon, Sir J. H., 734
Gosāla, 80, 99
Gough, Sir Hugh (Lord Gough), 735, 736, 739, 740, 759, 774
Gould, B. J., 897
Govardhan, 592
Government Museum, Madras, 229
Government of India, the, 775, 815, 818, 840–6, 899–913. *See also* Part III, Book II, Modern India, 823, *sqq. passim*
Government of India Act, 1919, 903 *sqq.*, 916, 969,
Government of India Bill, 1935, 908 *sqq.*, 975–6
Governor-General, powers of the, 707, 777–98 *passim*
Governor-General-in-Council, the, 781, 826, 838, 840–9 *passim*, 853, 855, 861, 865, 878, 899–913 *passim*, 922, 949. *See also* Government of India
Govind, Gūru, 493, 534, 728, 730, 731
Govinda I, 379
Govinda III, 161, 169, 170
Govindachandra, 159, 178, 179
Govindapur, 632
Graham, Dr. Frank, 938
Graham, General, 895
Grahavarman Maukhari, 148, 149
Grāma, the, 27, 188
Grand Trunk Road, 434
Grant, Charles, 786, 787, 810
Greeks, the, 107-14, 126, 127, 135, 202, 203, 204, 217, 219, 227, 228, 393, 573, 817
Gregorson, Dr., 898
Grey, General, 759
Grierson, Dr., 575, 576
Griffin, Sir Lepel, 733
Gṛihya Sūtras, the, 75, 77, 78, 88;
Gṛitsamada, 35
Gromyko, Andre, 1026
Growse, F. S., 575
Guhila Rājputs, the, 294, 379
Gujarāt, 168, 169, 172, 175, 178, 195, 269, 276, 291, 292, 293, 296, 304, 312, 322, 327, 329, 343, 344–7, 381, 390. 391, 393, 405, 411, 412, 415, 418, 425, 427, 438, 444, 445, 449, 465, 470, 475, 479, 519, 520, 533, 534, 538, 539, 554, 564, 565, 566, 582, 591, 626, 695, 718, 719, 984,
——, Sultānate of, 344–7
Gujarāt (Punjab), 740
Gujars, the, 189
Gulāb Singh (of Kāshmir), 769
Gulbadan Begam, 562, 572
Gulbarga (Ahasanābād), 350, 351, 352, 363, 413
Gulistān, Treaty of (1813), 744
Gumti, river, 321
Guntur, 379, 679, 681
Guptas, the, 116, 137–45, 146 *sqq.*, 152, 154, 157; administration, 184–8; social conditions, 188–92; religion, 192–200; literature, 200–1; art, 223; 233–6; genealogical table, 248
Gurgāon district, 536, 943
Gurjaras, the, 150, 155, 157, 160, 167
Gurkhas, the, 14, 383, 714–16, 732, 772, 865
Gurramkonda, 707
Gurudaspur, 534
Gurukul of Hardwar, the, 874
Gurus, Sikh, 492, 493
Guti, 674, 675
Gwalior, 173, 275, 276, 287, 327, 332, 333, 342, 421, 423, 440, 469, 477, 493, 539, 577, 670, 687, 699, 759, 760, 770, 772, 833, 834, 984,
——, Treaty of, 701
Gyantse, 896

Habibullah, Amīr, 892
Hadramaut, 488
Hāfiz, 336
Hāfiz Rahamat Khān, 684
Haidar Shāh, 348
Haidāru, 732
Haig, Sir Wolseley, 271, 287, 293 307, 312, 319
Haileybury College, 848
Hājī Ahmad, 532
Hājī Ibrāhīm Sarhindī, 573
Hājī Iliyās, *see* Shams-ud-dīn Iliyās Shāh
Hāji Maulā, 299
Hājīpur, 445
Hakalzāi, 751
Hakīm (brother of Akbar), 453

Hakim Dawāi, 481
Haksar, P. N., 1014, 1015, 1016
Hāla Sātavāhana, 135
Halākū, 289
Haldighāt, 443
Halebīd (Dorasamudra), 181, 245, 296, 297, 298, 312, 370
Halliday, Sir F. J., 794
Hamburg, 934
Hamīd Khān, 332
Hamīda Bānu Begam, 440
Hamilton, William, 633
Hamīr (of Mewār), 295, 379, 380
Hamīr Deva (of Ranthambhor), 294, 395
Hammīr-Mahākāvya, the, 294
Hammīrmada-mardana, the, 401
Hammond, Sir Lawrie, 937
Hamza Shāh, Saif-ud-dīn, 336
Hānsī, 271, 278, 291, 324
Hanumān, 87
Har Govind, Guru, 493
Har Kishan, Guru, 493
Har Rāi, Guru, 493
Harapāla, Deva, 304
Harappā, 16, 19, 24, 25, 35, 217, 223, 946
Harautī, 343
Haravijaya, the, 128
Hardinge, Charles, Lord, 912, 914, 924, 942
Hardwar, 328, 874, 1026
Hare, David, 811
Hari Pant Phadke, 673
Hari Singh Naola (Nalwa) 732
Hari Vijaya Surī, 451
Hariana, 428
Hariar I, 360, 361
Hariar II, 360, 361
Harichandra (Brāhmaṇa), 160
Harihara, 182, 359, 360, 361
Hariharpur, 630
Hara-kiri, 816
Harināth, 574
Hariśchandra, 86
Harisheṇa, 138, 139, 141, 200
Harisimha (of Tirhut), 383
Haritiputras, the, 167
Harivarman, 207
Harponelly, 706
Harris, General George (Lord Harris), 705, 707
Harsha (of Kanauj), 94, 147–53, 154, 156, 161, 168, 171, 178, 184, 185, 195, 196, 200, 433
Harsha Charita, the, 128, 142, 160, 194, 201
Harshadeva, 154
Hartog, Sir Philip, 944
Haryana, 989, 999
Haryanka kings (of Magadha), the, 56–8
Hasan (poet), 302
Hasan (father of Sher Shāh), 428
Hasan Abdāl, 487
Hasan 'Āli Khān, 490
Hasan-i-Dihlavī, 402
Hasan Khān (brother of Mahmūd Begarha), 346
Hasan Khān Mewāti, 421
Hasan, Zafar Khān, *see* 'Alā-ud-din Hasan Bahman Shāh)
Hasan-un-Nizāmī, 273–4
Hastings, Marquess of, 515, 701, 710, 711, 715–24 *passim*, 757, 758, 761, 808, 833
Hastings, Warren, 570, 767–71 *passim*, 676, 678, 681, 684–6, 687, 688, 689, 720, 721, 757, 763, 778, 779, 783, 784, 789, 790, 810, 895
Hastivarman, 140
Hatgarh, 772
Hāthrās, 536
Havell, E. B., 403, 948
Havelock, Sir Henry, 770, 771, 774
Hawkins, Captain William, 628
Hazāra, 62, 155, 372, 487, 737, 739,
Heath, Captain William, 632
Hegessander, 126
Heliodoros, 133, 231
Hellenistic art, 227
Helmud, river, 171
Hemachandra, 195
Hemādri, 182
Hemanta Sena, 179
Henry IV, Emperor, 385
Henry IV (of France), 635
Herakles (Indian), 78, 79, 86, 132
Heras, Rev. Father, 360
Herāt, 94, 447, 742, 743, 744, 746, 823, 824
Hermaios, 111
Herschell Committee, 858
Hewitt, General, 768
High Courts, 797
Hijli, 632
Hildebrand (Pope Gregory VII), 385
Himāchal Pradesh, 982, 991, 1000
Himālayas, the, 315, 405, 423, 431, 438, 448, 570, 593, 714, 720, 722
Hīmū, 396, 436, 439
Hinayāna Buddhism, 84, 133
Hindāl, 425, 426, 437,
Hindī language, 348, 395, 400, 481, 946, 996
Hindū Colonial Kingdoms, 202–16
Hindu Kingdoms: of Vijayanagar, 359–77; Orissa, 377–9; Mewār, 379–

81; Kāmarūpa and Assam, 381–2; Nepāl, 383
Hindu Law, Vikramādityan, 181
Hindu Marriage Act, 965
Hindu Marrige Validating Act, 1949, 965
Hindu-Pād-Pādshāhī, the, 538, 540, 719
Hindu Shāhiya dynasty of Waihand, the, 172–3
Hindu Succession, Act, 965
Hindu University, Benares, 876
Hinduism, 194, 195, 215–16, 399, 870, 875
Hindukush, the, 315, 447, 448, 467
Hindustan Steel Company, 955
Hindustānī, 574
—— Party, the, 524
Hippalus, 130
Hirani-Khera, 324
Hiraṇyagarbha, 37
Hiru (Pindarī), 717
Hislop, Sir Thomas, 702, 718
Hissār Fīrūzā, 324, 330, 426, 428
Hiuen-Tsang, 115, 146, 149, 150, 151, 153, 160, 168, 171, 185, 190, 191, 195, 196, 204, 233
Hobart, Lord, 683
Hodson, Major William (of Hodson's Horse), 771
Hogg, Sir Stewart, 853
Holdich, Sir T. H., 744
Holī, the, 562
Holkars, the, 672, 698–9, 718, 719, 720, 729
Holland, 627, 676, 800, 949. *See* Dutch
Holland, John, 679
Holmes, T. Rice, 769
Holwell, J. Z., 649, 650, 662
Home Government, the (Whitehall, the British Government), 806–20 *passim*, 840–1; *see also* Part III, Book II, Modern India, 823 *sqq.*
Home Guards, 920
Home Rule League, Besant's, 970; Tilak's, 970
Homer, 135
Horse-sacrifice (Aśvamedha), the, 41, 85, 108, 132, 141, 143, 154, 165, 167, 192, 200
Hossain, Kamal, 1014, 1015, 1017
Houghton, Lord, 878
House of Commons, 633, 809, 810, 840, 842, 847, 850, 880, 903. *See also* Parliament
Hoysalas, the, 181, 182, 195, 198, 244, 245, 295, 296, 297, 360, 376
Hpagyidoa, 723, 725
Hügel, Baron von, 733
Huglī, 465, 563, 624, 630, 632, 639, 652, 653, 654
Hultzsch, Dr. E., 317
Human sacrifices, 820
Humāyūn, 344, 347, 348, 353, 418, 423, 425–7, 429, 430, 431, 436, 437–9, 444, 480, 547, 557, 571, 572, 577, 581, 589, 591
Humāyūn (son of Muhammad Khān), 327
Humāyūn-nāmāh, the, 562, 572
Hume, Allan, 881, 882, 883
Huns, the, 143, 144, 146–7, 148, 157, 174, 189, 194, 393
Hungary, 953
Hunter, Sir William, 733, 867
Husain 'Ālī, Wazīr, 521–2, 547
Husain 'Ālī Sayyid, 530, 533, 536, 537
Husain Beg, 457
Husain Nizām Shāh, 358, 366
Husain Quli Khān, 651
Husain Safavī Shāh, 525
Husain Shāh (of Ahmadnagar), 468, 469
Husain Shāh (of Bengal), *see* 'Alā-ud-din Husain Shāh
Husain Shāh Sharqī, 340, 341, 410
Husain Shāhī dynasty, the, 341
Husaini, the, 402
Hūshang Shāh (Alp Khān of Mālwa), 342, 345, 352, 413
Hūshyār, 'Ain-ul-mulk, 352
Hutton, Dean, 694, 708
Huvishka, 116, 132
Hyder 'Alī, 541, 660, 671, 674, 675, 676, 677, 681, 682, 709, 734
Hyder Beg, 689
Hyderābād (Deccan), 473, 520, 531, 537, 589, 593, 634, 642, 658, 659, 681–2, 709, 710–11, 720, 769, 836, 838, 861, 943, 985–7, 991, 1020
——, University of, 943
Hyderābad (Sind), 753, 755

'*Ibādat-Khāna*, the, 451
Ibn Batūtah, 278, 298, 305, 307 *sqq.*, 313, 316, 325, 392, 393
Ibn Hauqal, 267
Ibn Khordadzbeh, 212
Ibn Rosteh, 212
Ibrāhīm (son of Sikandar), 333, 334
Ibrāhīm, Rukn-ud-din, 291
Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh I, 357, 395
Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh II, 358
Ibrāhīm Khān, 438
Ibrāhīm Khān Gardī, 541, 545
Ibrāhīm Lodī, Sultān, 333–4, 391, 419, 420, 421

Ibrāhīm Shāh Sharqī, 337, 341, 342, 410, 523
Ibrāhīm Sūr, 428, 439
Idar, 346
Ikeda, M., 1027
Ikdāla (Azadpur), 320, 321, 324
Iktiyār-ud-dīn Altūnīya, 278, 279
Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn Ghāzi Shāh, 336
Ikhtiyār-ud-din Muhammad, 270–1, 275
Ikshavākus, the, 55, 86, 87, 88, 110, 164
Ilak Khān, 268
Ilbarī Turks, the, 280, 287
Ilbert Bill, 880, 881, 885
Iliyās Shāh, 336; descendants of, 336, 598
Iltutmish, 274–7, 280, 281, 293, 335, 387
Imād Shāhī dynasty (of Berār), the, 357
Imād-ul-mulk, 528, 541
Imam, Sir, ʿĀlī, 903
Imam-i-ʿĀdil, the, 453
Imāmgarh, 755
Immadi Narasimha, 362
Imperial Civil Service, *see* Indian Civil Service
Impey, Sir Elijah, 779, 789, 790
Improvement Trusts, 917
Inam Commission, 766
Ināyat Khān, 574
Inchcape, Lord, 944
Income Tax, 857, 858
Indāpur, 469
Independence Day, 974, 991
India Act, Pitt's, 671, 673, 674, 678, 682, 780, 781, 782, 786,
India and Burma (Emergency Provisions) Act, 949
Indian Annual Register, 950, 951
India (Consequential Provision) Bill (1949), 991
India Council, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 855, 882, 883, 889–913 *passim*
India Independence Bill (1947), 981
India weekly, the, 883
Indian Archipelago, 202, 212, 215
Indian Association of Calcutta, 879 880
Indian Civil Service, the, 877–82, 885, 899, 916–20, 847–50
Indian Codes of Procedure, 798
Indian Colonial Kingdoms, 202–16
Indian Councils Act (1892), 967
Indian Council of Agricultural Research, 959
Indian Council for Cultural Relations, 964
Indian Government, *see* Government of India
Indian Historical Records, Commission, 947–8
Indian Liberal Federation, 970, 973
Indian Mercantile Marine, 927
Indian Military Academy, 923, 950
Indian National Army, 978, 1027
Indian National Conference, 881
Indian National Congress, 807, 845, 846, 849, 852, 872, 877–86, 891, 903, 907, 908, 912, 914, 941, 949, 955, 967–81 *passim*, 983, 989, 1026
Indian Navy, Royal, 922–3, 951, 978
Indian Ocean, 187, 363, 369, 623, 710, 953, 1017
Indian Penal Code, 797
Indian Press Act (1910), 968
Indian Retrenchment Committee, 944
Indian Revolt (1857–59), 722, 741, 758 760, 765–76, 783, 815, 833, 842, 844 848, 857, 864, 884, 894
Indian Sandhurst Committee, 922
Indian Science Congress, 947
Indian State Forces, 923
Indian States, the, 776, 833–9, 904, 907, 908, 909, 911–13, 932, 949, 951, 982–90, 991
——, Minor 757–63
Indian Statutory Commission, 572, 922, 944
Indian Tariff Board, 961
Indian Universities, *see* Universities
Indian Women's University, 945
Indīl Khān (Saif-ud-dīn Fīrūz), 338
Indo-China, 202, 205, 207, 215
Indo-Iranian Cultural Society, 952
Indore, 539, 672, 702, 984
Indra, 24, 25, 36, 38, 46, 78, 88, 132, 184
Indra III, 162, 170
Indra Singh Rathor, 494
Indraprastha, 89
Indrarāja, 153, 157
Indravarman, Mahārājadhirāja, 207
Indus, river, 61, 172, 328, 487, 746, 747, 753, 754, 755, 830, 831
—— valley, 268, 732; prehistoric civilisation of, 13, 15–23, 24, 25, 35, 37, 202, 223
Industrial Commission, 804, 934
—— Employment Act (1941), 956
—— Revolution, English, 805
Industry, *see* Trade
Infallibility Decree, Aśoka's, 453
Infanticide, 766, 816, 819
Inglis, Brigadier, 771

Innes, A.D., 756, 760, 767, 769
Instrument of Transfer, the, 837, 838
International Court of Justice, Hague, 1015
International Labour Conference (1947), 952
Iqbāl, Sir Muhammad, 977
Iqbālmand, 292
Iqbālnāmāh-i-Jahāngīrī, the, 458, 573, 574
Iqta's, the, 386
Irādat Khān, 463
Irāk, 172, 315
Irānians, the, 171, 524, 591
Iron Age, 13
Iron Pillar, Delhi, 235
Irrāwāddy, river, 723, 724, 727
Irrigation, Mauryan, 122; in Kāshmīr, 155; in Tughluq period, 323–4; Bahmanī, 355; Modern, 868, 939-40. *See also* Canals
Irvine, W., 549, 556
Irwin, Lord, 907, 973
'Isā Khān (of Dacca), 446
'Isā Khān (of Koil), 332
Iśanavarman Maukhari, 148. 156
Iselin, Colonel, 898
Ishwar, Dās, 574
Ishwari Prasad, 294, 307, 313
Isidore (of Charax), 112
Islam, 8, 170, 171, 203, 215, 216, 267, 268, 273, 274, 275, 289, 290, 299, 304, 345, 359, 395, 396, 398, 399, 403, 418, 447, 451, 452, 474, 480, 489, 490, 547, 592, 870, 874, 892, 940
Islām Movement, the New, 948
Islām Khān (governor of Bengal), 459
Islām Khān Lodī, 332
Islām Khān Rūmī, 523
Islām Shāh Sher, 436, 553
Islām, Syed Nazrul, 1012
Islamabad, 1016, 1017
Islamic Art and Architecture, 403–15
Islamic Summit, Lahore, 1017
Isle of France (Mauritius), 636, 639, 705, 709
Islington Commission, 917
Ismā'īl 'Ādil Shāh, 357, 363
Ismā'īl Mukh, Nāsir-ud-dīn Shāh, 349
Ismā'īl Safavī, 418*n*
Ispahān, 800
Israel, 1029
Iśvara, 79
Iśvaradeva (Śiva), 152
Iśvarasena, 164
Italy, 949
I'timād Khān, 444
I'timād-ud-daulāh (Mīrzā Ghiyās Beg), 457, 459
I-tsing, 191
Izid Bakhsh, 478
'Izz-ud-dīn 'A'zam-ul-mulk, 335

Jabbalpur, 143
Jacatra, 625
Jackson, Coverly, 766, 771
Jackson, Prof. (of Chicago), 939
Jacobin Club, 705
Jacquemont, V., 733
Jagadishpur, 766
Jagannāth, temple of, 377, 379
Jagat (Dvārakā), 346
Jagat Seth (banker), 650, 651, 653
Jagat Seth Fateh Chānd, 532
Jagatsimha,383
Jagayyapeta, 229
Jagdalak Pass, 750, 752
Jāgīr system, the, 306, 322, 327, 334 429, 487, 537, 539, 540, 548, 549, 550, 553, 688, 689, 703
Jahān Khān, 528
Jahān Shāh, 520
Jahānārā, Begam, 470, 473, 474, 477, 572
Jahāndār Shāh, 520, 521, 524
Jahāngīr, 449, 450, 453, 456–63, 468, 493, 549, 552, 556, 558, 559, 563, 567, 571, 572, 573, 574, 584, 589, 593, 594, 628, 629
Jahansūz, the, 269
Jai Singh, 479
Jaichānd (of Kanauj and Benares), 269, 270, 271
Jaidev, 492
Jails and Police, the, 920–1
Jaimall, 442
Jaina literature, 401
Jainas, the, 57, 60, 69, 70, 71, 78, 80–1, 84, 92, 94, 102, 103, 119, 128, 132, 133, 146, 194, 195, 196, 372, 403, 406, 452, 454
Jaintiā, 725, 758
Jaipal (Jayapāla), 163, 172, 173
Jaipur, 533, 593, 697, 699, 720, 834
Jaisalmer, 443, 720
Jaitak, 715
Jaitpur, 761
Jājau, 520
Jājnagar, 283, 320, 321. *See also* Orissa
Jalāl Khān Lodī, 334
Jalāl Khān Lohānī, 428
Jalāl Khān Sher, 436, 553,
Jalāl-ud-dīn Fīrūz Shāh, *see* Fīrūz Shāh Khaljī
Jalālābād, 158, 735, 750, 752, 892
Jalālī, 281, 332
Jalalpur, 64

Jālandhar, 107, 150
Jalauka, 102
Jalāun, 760
Jālianwāllā Bāgh, 971
Jalnāpur, 697
Jālor, 295, 346
Jām Bābaniya, 332
Jām-i-Jahān Numā, the, 562
Jamā'at Khāna Masjid, the, 407
Jamāl Khān Sarang Khānī, 428
Jambu-dvīpa, 3–4
James I, 629
James II, 630, 633
James, Commodore, 634
Jāmi' Masjid, the, 411, 413, 481, 581, 586
Jammu, 328, 728, 987–9, 991
Jammu and Kashmir, 989
Jamrūd, 494, 890
Jāms, the, 312
Jamshed (artist), 592
Jamshīd (of Golkundā), 359
Jamshīd (of Kāshmīr), 347
Jamunā, river, *see* Jumnā
Jan Muhammad, 576
Janaka, 40, 87
Janamejaya, 40, 86, 87, 89
Janata Party, 1005
Jang Bahādur, Sir, 769, 772, 773
Janjīra, 508, 510, 514
Jankojī Rāo Sindhia, 542, 545, 759
Jaorā, 720
Japan, 205, 229, 627, 800, 816, 886, 933, 950, 960, 967, 976, 977, 978
Japan, relations with India, 1026–7
Jarāsandha, 89
Jarib, the, 471
Jarring, Gunnar, 988
Jasrat Khokar, 331
Jaswant Rāo Holkar, 691, 693, 695, 698, 699
Jaswant Singh, 475–6, 479, 487, 494
Jātakas, the, 68, 85, 206, 224
Jāts, the, 490, 522, 528, 533, 535, 541, 561, 672, 816
Jaugaḍa, 96
Jauhar, rite of, 65, 294, 395, 442
Jauna Khān, Muhammad, 307, 308, 309. *See also* Muhammad bin Tughluq
Jaunpur, 321, 324, 327, 329, 332, 334, 337, 338, 341–2, 343, 403, 405, 410, 426, 428, 430, 438, 440, 563, 565, 567
Java, 206, 212, 214, 215, 233, 241, 388, 625, 627, 628, 662
Jāvlī principality, 506
Jay Singh, 494, 497, 507–8
Jay Singh II, 533, 538
Jay Singh Surī, 401
Jaya Iśvaramūrti, 207
Jaya Simhavar, 207
Jaya-Sthitimalla, 383
Jayachandra (of Kanauj), 269, 270, 271
Jayadeva, 154, 201
Jayadhvaj, 486
Jayaji Rāo Sindhia, 759
Jayānanda, 575
Jayapāla, 163, 172, 173
Jayāpīḍa Vinayāḍitya, 155
Jayarudramalla (of Nepāl), 383
Jayastambha, Kūmbha's, 381
Jayavarman I (of Kambuja), 207
Jayavarman II, 207
Jayavarman VII, 207, 209
Jech Doāb (Punjab), 529
Jedda, 346, 800
Jejākabhukti (Bundelkhand), 178
Jesuits, the, 452, 465
Jeta (Rājput general), 432
Jetavana, 179
Jews, the, 372
Jhāin, 293
Jhāla, chief of, 443
Jhansī, 761, 766, 768, 772, 833, 963
Jhārkhand hills, 431
Jharokā-darsan, the, 489
Jhelum, river, 63, 328, 462, 728, 987
Jhindān, Rānī, 734, 737, 738, 739, 740
Jhinds, the, 729
Jihād, the, 489
Jijā Bāī, 505
Jinjī, 510, 516, 517, 660
Jinnah, Qaid-i-Azam, 973, 975, 976, 977, 980, 981
Jīvita Gupta II, 154
Jiwān Khān, 479
Jizya, the, 323, 348, 387, 455, 490, 495, 497
Jñāneśvara, 182
Jñātṛikas, the, 54, 80
Jodhpur, 434, 476, 494, 495, 533, 697, 702, 719, 912
Jones, Sir William, 811
Joshi, Narayan Malhar, 937, 939
Jubbulpore, 441
Jūd, 274, 275, 281
Judiciary, the, 919
Jujhār Singh Bundelā, 464
Jullunder, 291, 402, 440, 457, 528, 737
Jumnā, river, 27, 170, 286, 311, 324, 422, 456, 477, 534, 561, 563, 626, 670, 697, 709, 714, 730, 731, 772
Jūna Shāh, 326
Junagadh, 985
Junāgarh, 346
Junaid, *or* Junayd, 172

Junnar, 326, 506
Jury, trail by: in Southern India, 187; Modern, 808–9
Justice, Administration of: under the Guptas, 187; up to the Mutiny, 788–92
——, High Courts of, *see* High Courts
——, Supreme Court of, 778–9
Justin, 92, 93, 105
Jwālamukhī, 321
Jyotirmalla (of Nepāl), 383

Kabir, 398–400
Kabul, 94, 114, 172, 180, 334, 419, 420, 422, 423, 426, 437, 438, 446, 447, 450, 457, 462, 466, 500, 520, 525, 526, 527, 568, 584, 591, 623, 692, 705, 740, 741–52 *passim*, 823, 826, 827, 828, 893
——, Turki Shahiya Kings of, 171
Kachārīs, the, 381
Kachchapaghāta, Chief of, 174
Kadambas, the, 110, 148, 165, 167
Kadphises I, 113–14
Kadphises II, 114, 115, 130, 134
Kāfūr, Malik Naib, 182, 293, 296, 297, 298, 301, 303
Kai Khusrav, 284
Kailāsa, 246
Kaiqubād, 286, 288
Kaithal, 279, 329
Kaivarta caste, 187
Kaivarta chiefs, 160
Kākatīyas, the, 166, 167, 181, 182, 242, 269, 295, 296, 308
Kākavarnin, 59, 60
Kakhr-ud-dīn Mubārak Shāh, 335
Kakka (Pratīhāra), 158
Kalachuris, the, 147, 165, 167, 178, 179, 196, 246
Kaladi, 196
Kalāmandalam, the, 948
Kalāng, river, 485
Kalanga, 715
Kālanirnaya, the, 396
Kālāpāhār, 379
Kālāsoka, 59
Kalat (Kelāt), 171, 827
Kalhaṇa, 96, 102, 115, 116, 146, 154, 173, 201
Kālī, worship of, 819, 875
Kālidāsa, 102, 108, 142, 200
Kalikātā (or Kalighata), *see* Calcutta
Kalima, the, 489
Kalīmullah Shāh Bahmanī, 356
Kalinga, 54, 61, 94, 95, 96, 103, 110, 120, 121, 123, 178, 180, 181
Kālinjar, 173, 271, 426, 432, 443, 444
Kalkirāja, 146
Kallār, 171
Kalorās, the, 753
Kalpa-vṛiksha, the, 78
Kālpi, 327, 329, 342, 772
Kālsi, 96
Kalyān, 506, 507
Kalyāna (or Kalyāni), 170, 181, 196, 473
Kām Bakhsh, 501
Kama (Rājput general), 432
Kamalā Devi, 293
Kāmandaka, 201
Kāmarūpa, 140, 149, 150–1, 153, 156, 180, 381, 485, 486
Kāmata, *see* Kāmarūpa
Kāmatāpur, 340, 382
Kamboja, 54
Kambojas, the, 95, 158
Kambuja, 207, 208
Kambuja-deśa (Indo-China), 207, 208, 212, 214
Kampil, 281
Kāmpila, 40, 312, 330
Kampilī, 360
Kamrān, 425, 426, 437, 743
Kanarese districts (Kanara), 164, 165, 167, 168, 189, 194, 196, 674, 707
Kanauj, 144, 145, 148–54, 157, 160, 169, 173, 180, 201, 269, 329, 330, 430, 431
——, Pratihāra rulers of, 160–2
Kāñchī (Conjeeveram), 110, 140, 164, 165, 167, 191, 198, 239, 355, 361, 377, 659
——, Pallavas of, 165–7
Kandāchāra, the, 376
Kandāhār, *see* Qandāhār
Kandarpanārāyan, 446
Kāngra, 328, 461, 593, 728, 732
Kānhojī Angria, 634
Kanishka I, 84, 114–16, 133, 171, 201, 230
Kanjur, the Tibetan, 205
Kannada literature, 371
Kāṇva dynasty of Magadha, the, 35, 108, 109
Kānwā, *see* Khānua
Kāpaya Nāyaka, 318
Kapillavastu, 80, 82
Kapilendra, 182, 377, 379
Kāpiśa, 61, 112
Kapur Singh, 534
Karā, 288, 289, 290, 293, 329, 421
Kara-jal, 316
Karan (of Mewār), 459
Kararānī Sultāns, the, 379, 598
Karas, the, 195
Karatoyā, river, 382
Kārikāl, 626, 636, 999

Karīm Khān, 717, 718
Kārkhānās, the, 385
Kārkoṭas, the, 154, 172
Karkūn, 346
Kārle cave, 231, 244
Karma, doctrine of, 79, 80, 83
Karma mārga, the, 198
Karma Mimānsā, the, 401
Karna, 89
Karṇa Kalachuri, 159
Karnadeva II, Rāi, 295, 296
Karnāl, 525
Karnasuvarṇa, 150, 156
Karṇāṭa, 164, 167, 168, 179, 180, 196
Karnātak, the, 374, 472, 488, 504, 511, 537
Karnāvatī, Rānī (of Mewār), 427
Karnul, Nawāb of, 759
Kartripura, 140
Kārttikeya, 78, 118, 193
Kāruvāki, 100, 126
Kārwār, 510
Kāshghar, 488
Kāshmīr, 96, 102, 115, 116, 133, 150, 151, 154–6, 163, 173, 184, 189, 196, 238, 347–8, 405, 413, 428, 447, 475, 493, 500, 527, 528, 566, 584, 732, 737, 804, 838, 977, 985, 987–9, 991, 1008
——, Chronicles of, 96–7, 102, 161
——, History of, Shahabadi's, 573
——, Shāhi Kings of, 162
——, Sultānate, of, 346–8
Kāshmīr Gate (Delhi), 771
Kāshmīr Question, 1014, 1024
Kāsī Rāo, 699
Kāsīm Khān, 447
Kāsīrām Dās, 576
Kāsis, the, 39, 54, 55
Kaśyapa Mātaṇga, 133
Kātachchuris, *see* Kālachur
Katehr, 281, 330
Kathaioi, the, 62
Kathāsaritsāgra, the, 206
Kāṭhiāwār, 93, 113, 122, 137, 142, 143, 160, 162, 170, 172, 173, 984, 985
Katmandu, 383, 716
Kātwah, 654, 657, 664
Kātyāyana, 86
Kaufmann, General, 828
Kaumudi mahotsava, the, 200
Kaundinya, 207
Kaur, Rajkumari Amrit, 966
Kaurāli, 762
Kauśāmbī (Kosam), 40, 58, 72, 76
Kautiltya Arthaśāstra, the, 119, 121, 123, 125, 129, 131, 134, 156
Kautilya (Chāṇakya), 61, 91, 92, 106, 119
Kāvadia, 369
Kāverī, river, 166, 168, 170, 377, 500; reservoir, 928
Kavikankan Chandī, the, 576
Kavi-Kulash, 516
Kavirāja, the, 200
Kāyastha, the, 187
Kaye, Sir J. W., 746, 747, 748, 751, 752, 761, 762
Kayūmars, 286
Keane, Sir John (Lord Keane), 747, 748, 754
Keating, Colonel Thomas, 669
Kedār Rāi (of Vikrampur), 446
Kediri, 214
Keene, H. G., 432
Keith, Prof. A. B., 899
Keladi, 367
Kelāt (Kalat), 171, 827
Kemal Pasha, 973
Kennedy, Pringle, 447*n*
Kerala, 999
Kerala country, the, 110, 196
Kerala Land Reforms (Amendment) Acts, 1002
Keralaputra, 96
Kesari, Tilak's, 884
Keśavasena, 180
Keshab Chandra Sen, 869, 870, 871
Khaḍga dynasty, the, 167
Khāfī Khān, 470, 479, 491, 502, 507, 515, 516, 517, 521, 531, 574,
Khairpur, 753, 755
Khajurāho, 178, 237
Khajwah, 477, 484
Khalifāhs, the, 171, 275, 304, 318, 322, 384, 547, 553
Khalīlullāh, 476
Khaljī Sultāns of Mālwa, the, 342–4
Khaljīs, the, 286, 288–305, 310, 312, 387, 390, 407, 448; genealogical table, 596
Khālsā, the, 535, 728, 732; Army, 759; College (Amritsar), 940; Chief Diwan, 940
Khālsā (crown lands), the, 386, 550
Khams the, 323, 386
Khān Jahān 469
Khān Jahān Lodī, 464
Khān-i-'A'zam (general), 352
Khān-i-'A'zam 'Aziz Koka, 450, 457
Khān-i-Daurān, 469, 524
Khān-i-Jahān Maqbūl, 322, 326
Khān-i-Sāmān, the, 550
Khān-i-Shahīd Muhammad, 282–3
Khān-i-Zamān, 469
Khāndān-i-Tīmurīā, the, 591

Khande Rāo, 699
Khāndesh, 327, 348, 438, 448, 449, 468, 470, 471, 496, 537
Khānua (or Kānwā), 381, 421, 422, 432, 441
Kharāj (land tax), the, 323, 386
Khāravela, 110, 112, 133
Kharda (*or* Kurdla), 674, 682, 691, 709, 710
Kharoshṭhī inscriptions, 136
Khartoum, 953
Khasdār, the, 280
Khasgi-wālā, 759
Khāsis, the, 14
Khataians, the, 387
Khattaks, the, 487, 488
Khāzin, the, 386
Khelna, 354
Khens, the, 382
Kherla, 342
Khilafat Movement, 971, 972, 973
Khirki, 702
Khiva, 276, 488, 823, 825, 826
Khizr Khān Sayyid, 295, 296, 303, 329, 330, 331
Khizrābād (Chitor), 295
Khojāk Pass, 747
Khokors, the, 272, 274, 276, 327, 331
Khonds, the, 820
Khotan, 204
Khrushchev, N. S., 1025
Khulāsat-ut-Tawārīkh, the, 574
Khurāsān, 315, 531
Khurram, Prince, 448, 449, 459, 460. *See also* Shāh Jahān
Khursau Qulī, 592
Khūsh-hāl Khān (Khattak), 487–8
Khusrav (son of Jahāngīr), 450, 457, 458, 463, 492, 501
Khusrav Khān, Nasir-ud-dīn, 304, 305, 306
Khusrav Malik, 269
Khusrav Shāh, 269
Khutba, the, 318, 347, 431, 453, 469, 484
Khwāja 'Abdus Samād, 567, 591, 592
Khwāja, Abid (governor or Lahore), 529
Khwāja Abid Shaikh-ul-Islam, 530
Khwāja Hāji, 296, 297
Khwāja Jahān (Bahmanī minister), 354
Khwāja Jahān (of Jaunpur), 239, 341
Khwāja Jahān Mahmūd, *see* Mahmūd Gāwān
Khwāja Jamāl-ud-dīn, 280
Khwāja Mansūr, 446
Khwāja Qutb-ud-dīn (of Ush), 277
Khwāja Serhurd, 634
Khwājā Tash, 292
Khwāja-i-Jahān, 319
Khwārazm, *see* Khiva
Khyber Pass, 494, 722, 740, 747, 752, 827, 828, 890
Kiā-che (Kassapa), 56
Kibe, Sardār Rāo Bahādur, 672
Kieu-tsieu-k'io, 113, 114
Kikatas, the, 27, 55–6
Kilokhrī, 278, 286, 288
Kilpatrick, Major James, 657
Ki-pin 112, 114
Kirat Singh 332
Kirātas, the, 45
Kiratpur, 493
Kirkpatrick, William, 710
Kirmān, 273
Kīrtimalla (of Nepāl), 383
Kīrtivarman (Chandella), 178
Kīrtivarman I(Chalukya), 167
Kishangarh, 720
Kishi, N., 1027
Kishkindhyā, 87
Kishlū Khān (Bahrām Aiba), 317
Kishori Lāl Goswāmi, Raja, 901
Kissinger, Henry, 1028
Kitchener, Lord, 864, 865, 921, 922
Kittur, 673
Kiul, 430, 577
Koch Bihār, 341, 382. *See also* Cooch Bihār
Koch Hājo, 382, 485. *See also* Cooch Bihār
Koh-i-nūr diamond, the, 526, 732
Koīl, 271, 333
Kokī Jihu, 576
Kolābā, 760
Kolhāpur, 507, 510, 540, 769, 985
Kols, the, 14
Konākamana, 101
Konāraka, 377
Kondapalli, 363
Kondavidu, 363
Kondavīr, 354
Konkan, the, 93, 113, 167, 352, 353, 354, 363, 507, 701
Kooch, 699
Kopargāon, 699
Koppam, 181
Kora, 684
Koran (Quran), the, 279, 280, 452, 453
Korea, 205
Koregāon, 702
Korkai, 202
Kosala, 39, 54, 55, 57, 58, 67, 85, 140
Kota dynasty, the, 139
Kotah, 698, 720, 772

Kothari, D. S., 963
Koṭṭam, the, 188
Koṭṭura, 140
Kotwāl, the, 386, 551
Kṛishna, worship of, 36, 46, 78, 87, 88, 89, 134, 168, 397, 574–5
Kṛishṇā, river, 164, 169, 182, 229, 350, 377, 449, 538, 541, 642, 680
Kṛishṇa I, 169, 244
Kṛishṇa III, 170
Kṛishṇa Devakīputra, 79
Kṛishṇa Miśra, 178, 201
Kṛishṇa Nāyaka, 318
Kṛishṇa Rāo Kadam, 759
Kṛishṇa Udaiyar, Rājā, 758
Kṛishṇachandra (of Nadiā), 576
Kṛishṇadās (son of Rājballabh), 648
Kṛishṇadās Kavirāj, 397, 575, 576,
Kṛishṇadeva Rāya, 362, 363, 364, 370, 371, 372, 373, 379, 397
Kṛishṇajī Bhāskar, 506
Kṛishṇapāla (general), 294*n*
Krivis, the, 40
Krori, the ,554
Kshaharātas, the, 113, 137
Kshatriya caste, the, 42, 44, 54, 56, 60, 68, 73, 74, 92, 134, 168, 188, 189, 206, 373
Kshema Gupta, 155
Kshemendra, 201
Kshemiśvara, 162, 201
Kshetra Simha (of Mewār), 380
Kshīrasvāmin, 155
Kshudrakas, the, 62
Kubera, 140
Kuberanāgā, 142
Kubja Vishṇuvardhana, 168
Kublai Khān, 207, 314
Kūdal Śangaman, 181
Kūla-Chandra, 835
Kujula Kaja, 113–14
Kulasekhara, 297
Kulinism, 180, 561
Kulluka, 396
Kulottuṅga, I, 181
Kumāon, 715, 716
Kumāra (Bhāskaravarman), 153
Kumāra (Kārttikeya), 78
Kumāra Gupta I, 143
Kumāra Gupta III, 144, 148
Kumāradevī, 137–8
Kumāraghosha, 212
Kumārajīva, 194
Kumāralāta, 135
Kumārāmātya, the, 186, 188
Kumārapāla, 175
Kumārapāla (of Bengal), 159
Kumārapāla Chaulukya (of Anhvara), 195
Kumārapāla (of Gujarāt), 184
Kumārila, 198
Kumbha, Rānā, 343, 380
Kumbhakonum, 243
Kumbhalgarh, 346, 381
Kumbhān Dās, 572
Kunāla, 102
Kuṇḍapura, 80
Kunwār Singh, 766, 769
Kunzru, Hriday Nāth, 939
Kurala, 140
Kurdla, *see* Kharda
Kūṟṟam, the, 188
Kurram district, 828, 890
—— Pass, 828
Kurukshetra, battle of, 40, 89
Kurus, the, 39, 40, 45, 54, 56, 74, 85, 88, 89, 90
Kuśa, 87
Kushān-Sātavāhana era, the, 198
Kushāns, the, 112, 113–16, 118, 130, 134, 135, 204, 229
Kuśīnagara, 83
Kusthalapur, 140
Kutumbins, 168
Kuvera, 184

La Bourdonnais, Count de, 639, 640
Labour, 935–8, 954, 956–7
Labour Party, 978
Lad Mālikā, 429
Ladakh, 1006-7
Lady Hardinge Medical College, Calcutta, 942
Lahore, 269, 273, 274, 277, 278, 279, 282, 312, 329, 331, 332, 334, 420, 434, 437, 457, 459, 463, 478, 494, 525, 528, 535, 541, 563, 566, 567, 568, 584, 589, 728, 729, 732, 734, 737, 748, 739, 741, 742, 746, 748, 754, 815, 919, 973, 977, 1014
Lahorī Bandar, 568
Lake, Lord, 695, 698, 699, 726, 729
Lākhā (of Mewār), 380
Lakheri, 672
Lakhmaniya, Rāi, 180
Lakhnautī, 272, 276, 283 308, 312, 335
Lakshmaṇa, 87, 160, 361
Lakshmaṇa Sena, 180, 271, 273*n*
Lakshmī Bāi, Rānī (of Jhansi), 772, 773, 774
Lakshmī Karṇa, 89, 178, 179
Lāl Kumārī, 521
Lāl Singh, 735, 737
Lālā Hansrāj, 873–4
Lālā Lajpat Rāi, 873
Lalit Kala Akademi, 964
Lalita Mādhava, the, 401

Lalitāditya, 154, 156
Lalliya Shāhi, 155, 162, 171
Lally, Count de, 658, 659, 660, 661
Lambert, Commodore, 726, 727
Lancashire cotton mills, 888, 935
Lancaster, Captain James, 628
Land Mortgage Bank, the, 931
Land Revenue, in Maurya Empire, 121; under the Guptas, 187; in Vijayanagar Empire, 374–6; in Turko-Afghān era, 386–7; in Mughul era, 471–2, 511; later, 766; in Bengal, 787; in modern times, 926
Land settlements: Afghān, 433; Mughul, 471, 553–6; Bengal, 787, 792
Landour, 716
Lane-Poole, Stanley, 267, 311, 313, 424, 426
Languages of South India, 13
Laṅkā (Ceylon), 87
Lansdowne, Lord, 830, 845, 850, 893
Laos, 210
Laswarī, 695
Laṭṭalur (Latur), 168
Lava, 87
Law, Hindu, 797
—— Muslim, 501, 797
Law, Jacques, 643, 644, 646
Law Commission, the, 782
Lawrence, Sir George, 749, 750, 769
Lawrence, Sir Henry, 737, 738, 740, 741, 763, 766, 771, 774
Lawrence, Sir John (Lord Lawrence), 738, 741, 769, 771, 774, 824, 825, 864, 879
Layton, Sir W. T., 925
League of Nations, the, 916, 936
Lee Commission, 918–21
Lee-Warner, Sir William, 761
Leese, Gen., 950
Legislation, 840–6, 847–66, 899–913
Legislative Councils, 883, 899–913
Lenoir, P. C. (governor of Pondicherry), 636
Lespinay, Bellanger de, 635
Levirate marriage, 71
Leyden, 425
Lhasa, 894, 895, 896
Libya, 953
Lichchhavis, the, 54, 71, 137, 142
Lilabati, the, 573
Lindsay, Dr. A. D., 944
Linga, cult of the, 36, 38, 195
Linlithgow, Lord, 908, 930, 978
Lisbon, 624
Literature: Aryan, 35, 47–52; in Magadhan era, 85–90; in Mauryan era, 118–19; in Gupta era, 200–1; in Vijayanagar Empire, 370 –2; in Turko-Afghān era, 393–403; in Mughal era, 571–7; in modern times, 946
Llyod Dam, the, 928
Local Self-Government (1858-1905), 850–5; (1906–36), 916–17
Lodis, the, 332–5, 407, 419–20; genealogical table, 597
Lohānīs, the, 334, 419
Lohara dynasty, the, 155
Lohgarh, 534
Lokavibhāga, the, 165
London, University of, 814
Longhurst, A. H., 372
Louis XIV, 483
Lower Chenāb Canal, 864
Lower Ganges Canal, 864
Lucknow, 593, 769, 771, 804, 917, 969, 970
—— University of, 943
Ludhiānā, 730, 731, 732, 735, 736, 742, 743
Lumbinigrāma, 82
Lumsden, John, 713
Lutf-un-ṅisā, 656
Lyall, Sir Alfred, 676, 686, 687, 688, 714, 722
Lyall, Sir James, 862
Lyallpur, 930
Lytton, Lord, 827, 828, 829, 861, 878, 880, 912, 924

Ma'āsir-i-'Ālamgīrī, the, 574
Ma'āsir-i-Jahāngīrī, the 574
Ma'āsir-i-Rahīmī, the, 573
Ma'bar, 296, 297, 298, 312, 317
Macartney, Lord, 678
Macaulay, Lord, 685, 798, 812, 813, 878
McCaskill, Sir John, 735
MacDonald, Ramsay, 907, 917, 969, 974
MacDonnell, Sir Antony, 862, 932
Macheri, 697
Mackenzie, Collin, 749
Maclagan Committee, 931
MacMahon, Sir Henry, 897
MacMahon Line, the, 897
Macnaghten, Sir William, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749. 751
McNeill, Sir John, 745
Macpherson, Sir John, 671
Madagascar, 635
Madanapāla, 159, 396
Madanapārijāta, the, 396
Mādhava Gupta, 156
Mādhava Rāo I, 546, 668, 670, 684, 703
Mādhava Rāo II, 672

Mādhava Rāo, Sir T., 834
Mādhava Rāo Nārāyan, 670, 691
Mādhava Vidyāranya, 359–60, 371, 396, 400
Mādhavāchārya, 573
Madhva, 198
Madhya Bhārat Union, 984, 991
Madhya Pradesh, 991
Madhya-deśa, the, 4, 5, 26, 67, 68, 107, 143, 149, 153, 178, 179, 189, 195
Madhyamikā, 108
Madrakas, the, 140
Madras, 181, 510, 629–35 *passim*, 637, 639, 640, 641, 643, 651, 652, 658–62 *passim*, 675, 676, 677, 679, 682, 683, 697, 705, 720, 724, 725, 759, 761, 778, 781, 782, 794–5, 797, 798, 800, 810, 813, 815, 844, 845, 853, 855, 858, 861, 862, 864, 865, 869, 881, 883, 887, 914, 931, 932, 937, 945, 946, 973, 986, 991, 993
——, Carnatic, the, 510
——, Fort St. George, 630
Madras Mahājan Sabhā, 881
Madrid, Treaty of, 626
Madurā, 110, 243, 296, 298, 317, 364, 804
Magadha, 40, 44, 53–66, 107–9, 116, 144, 145, 150, 154, 340; administration, 67–71; social life, 71–4; economic condition, 75-7; religion, 77–85; literature, 85–90
Magas of Cyrene, 98, 104
Māgha, 201
Magistracy, the, 852, 854, 881
Mahā Singh, 457, 729
Mahabalādhikrita, the, 186
Mahābat Khān, 461, 462, 464, 523
Mahābat Khān Sūr, 428
Mahābhārata, the, 7, 62, 72, 78, 79, 86, 88–90, 134, 135, 200, 215, 341, 348, 400, 401, 573, 576
Māhad, 506
Mahādājī Sindhia, 515, 526, 670, 671, 672, 673, 676, 691, 703, 730
Mahādandanāyaka, the, 186
Mahādeva, 46, 160
Mahākāntāra, 140
Mahākosala, 55
Mahāl, the, 511
Māham Anaga, 440
Mahāmokshaparishad, the, 151
Mahānandin, 58–59, 60
Mahānayākāchārya, the 375
Mahānirvāna Tantra, the, 869
Mahāpadma Nanda, 58, 60
Mahāpradhāna, the, 186
Mahārāja, the, 188
Mahārājpur, 759
Mahārāshtrā, 164, 167, 168, 182, 503, 504, 512, 516, 545, 561, 692, 703, 871
Mahāsabhā, the, 188
Mahāsthān, 96, 946
Mahāvīra, Vardhamāna, 57, 58, 80–1, 84
Mahāyāna Buddhism, 133
Mahé, 636, 660, 676, 999
Mahendra, Prince, 98, 140
Mahendrāditya (Kumara Gupta I), 143
Mahendragiri, 140
Mahendrapāla Pratihāra, 162
Mahendravarman I, 165, 167, 168, 185, 196, 200, 246
Maheshwar, 672
Māheśvaras, 79, 195
Mahfuz Khān, 675
Mahidpur, 702
Mahīpāla I, 158, 181
Mahīpāla II, 159
Mahīpāla Pratihāra, 161, 169, 170
Mahlak Deva, Rāi, 295
Mahmūd (Sultān of Delhi), 328, 329
Mahmūd Begarha (Abul Fath Khān, of Gujarāt), 345, 346, 349, 354
Mahmūd Gāwān (Khwāja Jahān), 354, 355, 356, 357, 358
Mahmūd of Ghaznī, 155, 162, 170, 173, 174, 267, 268, 269, 389
Mahmūd Khaljī (of Mālwa), 343, 346, 413
Mahmūd II Khaljī (of Mālwa), 344, 346, 395
Mahmūd Lodī (son of Sikandar Lodī), 421, 426
Mahmūd Shāh (of Bengal), 429, 430
Mahmūd Shāh (son of Ibrāhīm, of Jaunpur), 341
Mahmūd Shāh (of Kābul), 742, 743, 752
Mahmūd Shāh Bahmanī, 355, 358
Mahmūd Shāh Khaljī (of Malwa), 331, 354
Mahmūd Shāh Sharqī (of Jaunpur), 332
Mahoba, 271, 312, 329
Mahodaya (Kanauj), 160
Mahomet, the Prophet, 171, 550
Mahsūds, the, 891
Māhulī, 506
Mainpurī, 536
Maintenance of Internal Security (Amendment Act), 1003
Maitrakas, the, 147
Maiwand, 828
Majapahit, 214–15

Majlis-i-Khalwat, the, 385
Majmudār, the, 386
Makhdūm-i-'Ālam, 341
Makhdūmah Jahān, 354
Makrān, 71
Makwanpur, 716
Malabar, 110, 196, 369, 631, 636, 680, 692, 800
Malabari Behramji, 877, 939, 941
Malacca, 215, 625
Mālādhar Basu, 401
Malakand Pass, 830, 890
Malaon, 715
Malartic, M., 705
Mālavas, the, 62, 65, 140
Malay Archipelago, 181, 205, 212, 214, 215, 369, 390, 627
Malay Peninsula, 181, 206, 210, 212, 214, 233, 976, 978
Malcolm, Sir John, 671, 679, 683, 697, 701, 702, 704, 710, 717, 718, 720, 742, 762
Māldah district, 272
Māldeo, 295
Māldev (of Mārwār), 432
Maldive Islands, the, 369
Malet, Sir Charles W., 679
Malhār Rāo Gaikwār, 834
Malhār Rāo Holkar, 539, 541, 542, 543, 545, 691
Malhār Rāo Holkar II, 702, 703
Malibah (Mālwa), 172
Malik, the, 281
Malik Ahmad (of Ahmadnagar), 358
Malik Ahmad Chap, *see* Ahmad Chap
Malik 'Ambar, 358, 460, 461, 468
Malik Ayāz, 346
Malik Chhajjū, 288
Malik Ghāzī Sahana, 324
Malik Ikhtiyār-ud-dīn, 180
Malik Jiwān Khān, 480
Malik Mubārak, 282
Malik Muhammad Jayasī, 395, 574
Malik Muqaddir, 283
Malik Naīb Kāfūr, *see* Kāfūr
Malik Nasīr, 349
Malik Rājā Fārūqī, 348
Malik Sarvar, 327
Malik Targhi, 283
Malik Yaklakī, 304
Malik-ush-Sharq, the, 327, 341
Malika Jahān, 289, 291, 353
Malikāpur, 346
Malkhed, 169
Mall, Rānā, 319
Malla-kara, the, 187
Mallas, the, 54, 55, 57, 383
Malleson, G.B., 736, 740, 771
Malikārjuna, 361
Mallinātha, 142
Mallū (son of Ismā'īl 'Ādil Shāh), 357
Mallu Iqbal, 328, 329, 332
Mallū Khān, Qādir Shāh, 344
Malvelly, 705
Mālwa, 93, 108, 109, 113, 137, 142, 146, 147, 165, 167, 169, 175, 178, 180, 191, 276, 289, 291, 295, 296, 312, 327, 329, 342, 343, 345, 346, 352, 381, 395, 403, 418, 427, 431, 432, 436, 438, 441, 442, 449, 475, 491, 519, 522, 530, 538, 539, 693, 695, 717, 718, 720, 984
——, Khaljī Sultānate of, 342–3
Māmallapuram, 165, 167, 239, 240, 244
Mān Singh (of Amber), 442, 443, 444, 450, 457, 574
Mān Singh (of Gwālior), 342
Mān Singh (feudatory of Sindhia), 772
Manasā Devi, 576
Mānavya *gotra*, the, 167
Manchester, 803
Mandala, 441
Maṇḍala, the, 188
Māndālay, 831, 832, 930
Mandasor, 139, 140, 147, 427, 519
——, Treaty of, 702, 720
Mandavi, 324, 760
Mandāwar, 276
Mandor (Viramgam), 172
Māndū, 295, 343, 344, 346, 412, 413, 427
Manekshaw, 1012, 1014
Mānikka Vasagar, 196
Manipur, 723, 725, 726, 835, 838, 985, 991, 989,
Manjha district, 529
Mankir, 166
Manma-Siddha III, 296
Manohar (artist), 592
Mānpur, 527
Mansabdār, the, 549–50, 556
Mansehra, 96
Mansel, Charles G., 741
Mansurah, 267
Manṭarāja, 140
Mantra, the, 47–50
Mantrī, the, 511
Mantrin, the, 186
Mantriparishad, the, 186
Manu, 125, 130, 186, 396
Manucci, 489, 519, 551, 593
Mānyakheta (Malkhed), 169
Manyu, 6
Mao, 134
Marātha Deshmukhs, the, 169
Marātha Wars, 668–71, 691–8, 699–702, 778

Marāthās, the, 168, 186, 358, 366, 460, 464, 485, 497, 498, 499, 500,503–19 *passim*, 522, 528, 529, 530, 532, 533, 534, 536–46, 570, 623, 624, 630, 634, 638, 642, 647 668–74, 678–86 *passim*, 730, 741, 757, 759, 772, 871, 884
Marāthī language and literature, 395, 400, 504, 946
Māravarman Kulasekhara, 296
Marcara (of Ispahān), 635
Marley, General, 715
Marmad (Mārwār), 172
Marryat Captain, 724
Marshall, Sir John, 217, 221, 396, 403, 414
Marshman, J., 689
Martabān, 727
Mārtāṇḍa, temple of, 155, 238
Martin, François, 635
Martindell, Sir Gabriel, 715
Maruts, the, 37
Mārwār, 113, 172, 421, 432, 494, 495, 496, 497, 533
Masālik-ul-absār, the, 390
Mascarenhas, Anthony, 1011
Mashkarins, the, 194
Masjids, 353
Massaga, 63
Mas'ud Khān, 343
Mas'ūdī, 267
Masulipatam, 568, 626, 630, 636, 642 659, 681
——, Treaty of, 678
Maternity Benefit Act, 1022
Mathews, Brigadier Richard, 677
Mathurā, 79, 89, 113, 116, 124, 132, 133, 173, 223, 225, 227, 228, 230, 490
——, ruins and sculptures of, 225 *sqq.*, 233
Matila, 139
Matsya, 54, 984
Mattavilāsaprahasana, the, 167
Maues (Moa or Moga), 112
Mauhan, 390
Maukharis, the, 147, 148
Maulāna Khwājagi, 403
Maulāna Muaiyyan-ud-dīn Umrānī, 402
Maulānā Shāh Muhammad Shāhābīdī, 573
Maulāna Sharf-ud-dīn Māzandarānī, 352
Mauritius, 636, 639, 705, 709
Maurya Empire, the, 91–106, 117–23, 124–36; government, 91–106, 117–23; administration, 119–23; social conditions, 124–9; trade and navigation, 129; currency, 131; industry, 131; religion, 132; literature, 134; foreign influence, 135; art, 217–23, 241. *See also* Mauryas
Mauryas, the, 4, 55, 60, 61, 66, 68, 78, 101, 103, 107, 167, 172, 186, 202, 448, 502; genealogical table, 248. *See also* Maurya Empire, 91–5
Māvalīs, the, 505, 508
Māyā, mother of the Buddha, 82
Mayo, Lord, 825, 826, 924
Mayūra, 153, 200
Mayurbhanj, 985
Mazzini, G., 879
Mecca, 171, 175, 399, 437, 440, 488, 631
Medical College, Calcutta, 812
——, Lady Hardinge, 942
Medical Service, Indian, 916
Medina, 175
Medinī Rāi, 344, 395
Mediterranean, the, 203, 589
Medows, Sir William, 679
Meer Niser 'Ālī (*or* Titto Meer), 765
Meerut, 271, 324, 328, 536, 768, 770
Megasthenes, 118, 119, 125, 126, 860
Meghalaya, 989
Meghavarṇa, 56
Meghnād Sāhā, Dr., 947
Mehdi 'Ālī Khān, 742
Meherauli Iron Pillar, 139, 140
Mehta, Hans, 965
Mehta, Pheroze Shah, 968
Mekala, 143
Melbourne, Lord, 745
Memoir of Central India, Malcolm's, quoted, 671, 679, 683, 701–2, 704, 717*n*, 718, 720
Menander, 108, 111, 133, 135, 136
Menon, K.P.S., 1024
Merv, 829
Mesolithic Age, 12
Mesopotamia, 21, 23, 24, 328, 347
Meston, Lord, 924
Metcalfe, Lord, 720, 726, 730, 808
Methold, W., 626
Mettur irrigation project, 928
Mewār, 294, 295, 343, 346, 379–81, 415, 422, 427, 442, 443, 444, 459, 460, 495, 497, 498, 533; Rānās of, genealogical table, 600–1
Mewāt, 281 327, 436, 491, 536, 816
Mexico, 953
Mhow, 772
Miān Bahādur Shāh, 449
Miāni, 756
Middleton, Resident in Oudh, 688
Middeton, Sir Henry, 629
Midnāpur, 662
Miftāh, the, 402

Mihira, 134
Mihiragula, 144, 146, 147, 196
Mihr-un-nisa, *see* Nūr Jahān
Mildenhall, John, 628.
Milindapañho, the, 129, 135
Military Administration: (1858–1905), 864–5, 882; (1906–37), 921–3
Mill, J.S., 683, 685, 712, 714
Milton, John, 474
Mīmāmsā, the, 191
Mindon, King, 831
Minhāj-ud-dīn, 403
Minhāj-us-Sirāj, 273–4, 277, 278, 279, 280
Minto, 1st Earl of, 715, 730
Minto, 4th Earl of, 912, 969
Mīr Ālam, 710
Mīr Arz, the, 551
Mīr Ātish, the, 550
Mīr Bahrī, the, 551
Mīr Bakshī, the, 550
Mīr Barr, the, 551
Mīr Fazl-ullāh Injū, 351
Mīr Jāfar, 562, 650, 653, 654, 656, 657, 658, 661, 662, 663, 665, 779, 800, 801
Mīr Jumla (governor of Bengal), 485, 486
Mīr Jumla (Muhammad Sa'īd), 472, 473, 477, 521, 523, 569, 627
Mīr Kasim, 662, 663, 664, 665, 800, 801
Mīr Madan, 654
Mīr Māl, the, 551
Mīr Mannu, 527, 528
Mīr Manzil, the, 551
Mīr Mun'īm, 528
Mīr Qamār-ud-dīn, *see* Nizām-ul-mulk Āsaf Jāh
Mīr Qasim, Syed, 989
Mīr Sayyid 'Alī, 591
Mīr Tozak, the, 551
Mīr Yunus Alī, 426
Mīr-i-Adal, the, 435, 552
Mīrā Bāī, 400
Miran (son of Mīr Jāfar), 656, 660
Mīranpur Katra, 684
Mirasdārs, the, 795, 796
Miris, the, 898
Mīrpur, 753, 756
Mīrzā Ghiyās Beg, 457. *See also* I'timād-ud-daulah
Mīrzā Haidar, 348
Mirzā Muhammad, *see* Sirāj-ud-daulah
Mīrzā Muhammad Hakīm (governor of Kabul), 438, 446
Mīrzā Muhammad Kāzim, 574
Mirzāpur, 717
Mishmis, the, 898
Misls, Sikh, 728, 729
Mithilā, 401
Mithra, 134
Mithradates I, 111
Mitra, 24, 25, 37
Mitra, Sir Ramesh Chandra, 883
Mizoram, 989, 1001
Mocha, 488, 800
Mohammed, 1018
Mohan Prasād, 779
Mohan Singh, 1027
Mohanlāl, 654, 656
Mohenjo-Dāro, 15–23, 24, 26, 35, 217, 223, 946
Mohmānds, the, 830, 891
Moin-ud-dīn Ahmad, 586
Moira, Earl of, *see* Hastings, Marquess of
Mokal (of Mewār), 380
Moluccas, the, 625, 628
Monghyr, 158, 439, 663, 664
Mongols, the, 207, 276, 279–84 *passim*, 287, 289, 291, 292, 293, 302, 304, 306, 312, 319, 322, 346, 353, 359, 384, 393, 396, 402. *See* also Mughuls
Monier-Williams, Sir M., 397
Monserrate, C. de, 552, 563
Monson, Colonel, 698, 778, 779
Montagu, Edwin S., 903, 941
Montagu-Chelmsford Report and Reforms, the, 903, 912, 916, 918, 922, 924–5, 935, 970
Montgomery, Sir Robert, 741
Monuments, 217–47, 946–8. *See also* Art
Mookerjee, Sir Asutosh, 943, 946
Moore, Edward, 708
Moors, the, 372
Moplahs, the, 765
Morar, 772
Morārī Rao, 643, 644
Moreland, W.H., 550*n*, 566, 567
Morieis, the, 92
Morley, Lord, 899, 901, 902, 906–7, 934, 968, 969,
Morley-Minto Reforms, the, 901, 902, 968–9
Mornington, Lord, *see* Wellesley, Marquess
Moscow, 939, 966, 1024
Mother-Goddess, the, 20, 22, 24, 37, 50
Motijhil, 648, 651
Mountbatten, Lord, 980, 981, 983, 986
Mousikanos, 63
Moynihan, Daniel Patrick, 1028
Mṛichchhakaṭikā, the, 200
Mu'azzam (uncle of Akbar), 453
Mu'azzam (son of Aurangzeb), *see* Bahādur Shāh of Delhi

Mubārak, Shaikh, 451
Mubārak Khān (of Khāndesh), 348
Mubārak Khān (of Suket), 332
Mubārak Shāh (Sayyid), 331
Mubārak Shāh II, 315
Mubārak Shāh Fakhr-ud-dīn, 317, 335, 336
Mubārak Shāh Qutb-ud-dīn Khaljī, 303, 304–5, 306
Mubārak Shāh Sharqī, 341
Mubārakābād, 331
Mubāriz Khān, *see* Muhammad ʿĀdil Shāh Sūr
Mudki, 735
Mudrā-Rākshasa, the, 200
Muftis, the, 386, 552
Mughlānī Begam, 528
Mughul Government, the, 547–8; the nobility, 548; public services, 548-50; chief officers, 550–1; police, 551; law and justice, 552–3; revenue system, 553–6; provincial government, 556; army, 556–8. *See also* Mughuls
Mughuls, the, 418–594, 623, 632, 633, 634, 637, 685, 697, 703, 712, 717, 719–22 *passim*, 728, 741, 757, 760, 765, 768, 769, 771, 817, 850, 857. *See also* Mughul Government *and* Mongols,
Mugs, the, 557, 570
Muhammad, Prince (son of Balban), 402
Muhammad II (of Gujarāt), 401
Muhammad II (of Turkey), 357
Muhammad ʿĀdil Shāh Sūr, 436, 439, 445, 473, 530
Muhammad ʿĀli (son of Anwār-ud dīn Nawāb), 642, 643, 647
Muhammad ʿĀli (Nawāb of the Carnatic), 675, 682, 683, 712
Muhammad ʿAmīn Khān, 472, 487, 522, 524
Muhammad ʿAʿzam (son of Aurangzeb), 495, 496, 500, 520, 536
Muhammad Bahmanī (brother of ʿAlā-ud-dīn II), 353
Muhammad bin Tughluq, 298, 309–18, 319, 321, 325, 326, 334, 336, 348, 349, 360, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 391, 392, 402, 403
Muhammad of Ghūr (Muʿiz-ud-dīn Muhammad bin Sām Sultān), 174, 268–72, 273, 274, 277
Muhammad of Ghūr, Qutb-ud-dīn, 268, 277
Muhammad Husain, the *Zarrinqalam*, 576
Muhammad Husain Nazirī, 573
Muhammad ibn-Kāsīm, 172
Muhammad Ibrāhīm (son of Rafī-us Shān), 522
Muhammad Jauna, 341
Muhammad Junaidī, 278
Muhammad Kām Baksh, 520
Muhammad Khān (son of Fīrūz Shāh), 326, 327, 329
Muhammad Khān, Sultān (brother of Dost Muhammad), 743
Muhammad Mirzā (of Persia), 744
Muhammad Murād (of Samarqānd), 592
Muhammad Nādir, 592
Muhammad Rezā Khān, 783
Muhammad Saʿīd, *see* Mīr Jumla
Muhammad Sāḷih, 574
Muhammad Sāqi, 574
Muhammad Shāh (of Bengal), 338
Muhammad Shāh, Bhīkhan (of Jaunpur), 342
Muhammad Shāh (of Delhi), 331, 521, 522, 525–6, 530, 576, 681
Muhammad Shāh (son of Fīrūz Tughluq), 344
Muhammad Shāh, Ghaznī Khān (of Mālwa), 343
Muhammad Shāh (of Gujarāt), 345
Muhammad Shāh (of Khwārazm), 275
Muhammad Shāh (brother of Sulaimān Shukoh), 478
Muhammad Shāh I Bahmanī, 350
Muhammad Shāh II Bahmanī, 351
Muhammad Shāh III Bahmanī, 343, 354–5
Muhammad Shāh Khān (Pathān), 718
Muhammad Sultān (son of Aurangzeb), 473, 478, 593
Muhammad Sultān (cousin of Humāyūn), 425
Muhammad Zahir (of Kābul), 893
Muhammad Zamān, 425
Muhammadābād (Chāmpāner), 346 401, 427
Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental Defence Association of Upper India, 885
Muhammadans, *see* Muslims
Muhtasib, the, 386, 489, 550
Muʿiz-ud-dīn Bahrām, 279
Muʿiz-ud-dīn Kaiqubād, 286
Muʿiz-ud-dīn Muhammad bin Sām, *see* Muhammad of Ghūr
Mūjahid Shāh Bahmanī, 351
Mūkammal Khān Gujarāti, 573
Mukherji, Haris, 884
Mukhlīspur, 534, 584
Mukhyapradhāna, the, 186

Muktāpiḍa, 154
Mukti Bahini, 1012
Mukunda Harichandana, 379
Mukundarā Pass, 698
Mukundarām Chakravarti, 576
Mūla prakritis, the, 184
Mūlaka, 54
Mūlarāja II Solanki, 175
Mullā Dāūd, 573
Mullā Qāsim Beg Tabrezī, 481
Mulrāj, Diwān, 738, 739
Multan, 172, 173, 267, 269, 272, 276, 278, 282, 291, 317, 319, 328, 329, 330, 403, 432, 434, 438, 478, 568, 728, 732, 735, 738, 739, 879
Mumtāz Mahal, 461, 463, 465, 481, 572, 586
Munar Bājī Deshpānde, 508
Mundās, the, 14, 59
Mundy, Peter, 466,
Municipalities, 852–5
Mun'īm Khān, 445–6, 564
Munīr-ud-daulah, 529
Muñja, 175
Munro, Sir Hector, 664
Munro, Sir Thomas, 680, 697, 708, 720, 725, 794
Munsif-i-Munsifān, the, 435
Munsifān, the, 433
Munsiffs, the, 791, 793
Muntakhab-ul-Lubāb, the, 574
Muny Begam, 779, 783
Muqaddam, the, 555
Muqarrab Khān, 516
Muqta, the, 386, 387, 388
Murā, 92
Murād, Prince, 358, 447, 448, 461, 467, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478
Murād II (of Turkey), 357
Murādābād, 530
Murshid Qulī Jāfar Khān, 531, 576, 634, 801
Murshid Qulī Khān, 471, 472, 500
Murshidābad, 531, 562, 648, 649, 650, 652, 656, 664, 724, 789, 790, 791, 793, 800
Murtazā Nizām, 358
Musangi, 181
Muscat, 800
Mushrif-i-Mamālik, the, 386, 551
Music: in the Mughul Court, 594; in Modern India, 948
Muslim Education, 402–3
—— Law, 501, 797, 834
—— League, the, 949, 968, 969, 970, 973, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 983
—— State in India, 384–9
Muslims, the, 175, 180, 182, 267–415, 421-570 *passim*, 591, 623, 624, 647, 672, 752, 765, 767, 768, 790, 799, 808, 813, 819, 834, 850, 864, 884, 885, 886, 901, 902, 906, 907, 910, 914, 941, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971–2, 973, 975, 976, 978, 979, 980, 981, 987
Mussoorie, 716
Mustafanagar, 645
Mustaufī, the, 551
Mustaufi-i-Mamalik, the, 386
Mutakhab-ut-Tawārīkh, the, 573
Mu'tamīd Khān, 458, 460, 574
Muttrā, 490, 509, 535, 536
Muwallads, the, 352
Muxadābād, *see* Murshidābād
Muzaffar Husain Mirzā, 447
Muzaffar Jang, 642
Muzaffar Khān Turbatī, 446, 554
Muzaffar Shāh I (of Gujarāt), 348
Muzaffar Shāh II, 344, 346
Muzaffar Shāh III, 444
Muzaffar Shāh, Zafar Khān, 304, 329, 345
Muziris, 202
Myede, 727
Mysore, 165, 195, 198, 244, 295, 359, 361, 367, 488, 510, 541, 593, 643, 644, 660, 674–80, 681, 682, 695, 704–7, 708, 710, 720, 757, 758, 833, 836, 837, 838, 861, 991

Nachna-ke-Talai, 236
Nadīa, 271, 272, 397
Nādir Shāh, 522, 524–6, 527, 531, 535, 539, 543, 589, 728, 741, 893
Nādira Begam, 479
Nāḍu, the, 188
Nāgabhaṭa I, 161
Nāgabhaṭa II, 157, 161, 169
Nāgadāsaka, 58, 59
Nāgadatta, 139
Nagaland, 989, 1000
Nagarahāra, 158
Nagarapati, the, 188
Nāgārjuna, 133, 135
Nāgārjunikondā, 119, 129, 133, 223, 229–30, 946
Nagarkot, 174, 321
Nāgas, the, 116 133, 137, 138, 142
Nāgasena (of Padmāvatī), 139
Nāgaur, 346
Nāgpur, 697, 701, 702, 761, 804, 833, 888, 930, 972
—— University, 943
Nahapana, 113
Nāib-Dīwan, the, 783, 784, 785
Nāib-Wazīr-i-Mamālik, the, 336

Nāib-Nāzim, the, 789
Naidu, Sarojinī, 945, 966
Naik, the, 374,
Naimishāranya, the, 7
Naini Tāl, 716
Nair, Sir Sankaran, 903
Nājib-ud-daulah, 528, 541, 543, 544
Najm-ud-daulah, 665, 666
Nakhlistān, 15
Nakula, 88
Nala, 90
Nālandā, 150, 158, 191, 205, 212, 235, 946
Nalgonda, 1020
Nāmadeva (Namdev), 398, 876
Nānā Fadnavis, 668–73, 691, 693, 703, 709
Nānā Sāheb (Bālājī II), 539
Nānā Sāheb (Dundu Pant), 762, 765,
Nanaia, 134
Nānak, Guru, 399, 491, 534, 728, 730
Nand Dās, 575
Nanda dynasty, the, 58, 60–1, 92, 106
Nandakumār, 635, 779, 780
Nandana, 173
Nandin, 139
Nandivardhana, 58, 59,
Nandivarman Pallavamalla, 166, 184
Nandurbār, 349
Nanjrāj (Dalwai of Mysore), 674
Nankana, 399
Nānnūr, 400
Nānyadeva, 383
Napier, Sir Charles, 640, 755, 756
Napoleon I, 500, 510, 661, 692, 709, 723, 730, 733, 802
Naqib Khān, 574
Nara (Arjuna), 87
Nara Nārāyan, 382
Nārada, 200
Narahari Chakravarty, 576
Narahari Mahāpātra, 574
Narasa Nāyaka, 362–3
Narasimha I (of Orissa), 377
Narasimha Gupta, 144
Narasimha Sāluva (of Vijayanagar), 362
Narasimhavarman I, 165, 166, 168
Narasimhavarman II, 167
Narasimhavarman Mahāmalla, 167, 240
Naravarman, 139
Nārāyan Rāo, 668
Nārāyan Singh (of Sambalpur), 761
Nārāyaṇa, 79, 88, 160, 194, 198
Nārāyaṇapāla, 158
Narbada, river, 346
Nargund, 673
Narmadā, river, 413, 448, 449, 503, 538, 539, 673, 702, 768, 769
Nārnol, 491
Narnulla, 697
Narwar, 139
Nāsatyas, the, 24, 25, 37
Nasīb Khān (Nusrat Shāh), 340, 341
Nāsik, 87, 110, 126, 164, 165, 244, 461, 510, 700, 804
——Trimbak, 346
Nāsir Jang, 642
Nasir Khān, 337, 353, 525
Nāsir Khān Mahmūd II, 346
Nāsir-ud-dīn (son of Fīrūz Shāh), 308
Nāsir-ud-dīn Abul Muzaffar Mahmūd Shāh, 337
Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd, 277, 280, 326, 403
Nāsir-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh II, 339
Nāsir-ud-dīn Muhmmad Shāh (Tātār Khān, of Gujarāt), 345
Nāsir-ud-dīn Nusrat Shāh, 340, 341
Nāsir-ud-dīn Qabācha, 271, 273, 275, 276
Nāsir-ud-dīn Shāh (Ismā'īl Mukh), 349
Nāsir-ud-Sultān, 395
Nāsir-ul-mulk (Nawab of Bengal), 742
Nāsirābād, 769
Nasser, 1029
Natarāja Siva, 246
Nāthamunī, 198
National Committee for India's Freedom, 952
National Committee of Women's Education, 965
National Committee on the Education of Women, 965
National Labour Commission, 1022
National Planning Committee, 955–6, 958
National Socialist Party (Muzaffar Group), 1014
Nationalism, India, 922, 961, 967*ff.*
Native States, *see* Indian States
Nauroz, the, 489
Navasāhasānka, Sindhurāja, 174, 175
Navskṛishṇa, Rājā (of Sobhābāzār), 577
Nawaz Khān Shāh, 470, 479
Nawāzish Muhammad, 657
Nāyaka, the, 374
Nāyanārs, 167, 196
Nayapāla, 159, 205
Nazar Muhammad, 468
Nāzim (or *Subahdār*), the, 556
Nazir (poet), 353
Nearchos, 65, 75, 127
Negapatam, 568, 676
Nehru, Pandit Jawaharlal, 935, 955, 974, 980, 932, 1007, 1024, 1027

Nehru, Pandit Motilal, 972
Nehru Report, 913, 922
Neill, Colonel, 769, 771, 774
Nelcynda, 202
Nellore, 296
Neolithic Age, 9–12, 15, 202, 217
Nepāl, 96, 137, 140, 205, 383, 671, 714, 769, 772, 773, 897, 1009, 1024,
——War, 714–15
Nerum, 172
Netherlands, 287, 639
New Delhi, 897, 1016
New Guinea, 215
New Mussalmāns, the, 289, 292, 294, 299, 302, 418
Niāmatullah, 574
Naizi, 1013
Nicholas I, of Russia, 823
Nicholson, Frederick, 931
Nicholson, John, 741, 771, 773, 774
Nichyas, the, 53
Nicobar Islands, 181, 991
Nicolls, Sir Jasper, 715
Nidhanapur, 150
Niemeyer, Sir Otto, 925
Nigāli Sāgar, 96
Nikitin, Athanasius, 356
Nilāmbar, 382
Nīlarāja, 140
Nile, river, 203
Nimeri, 953
Nimitz, Admiral, 988
Nirgranthas, the, 80
Nirvāṇa, meaning of, 83
Nishādas, the, 44, 45, 74
Nīshāpūr, 270
Nixon, Richard, 1028
Nizāms, the, 170, 359, 638, 642, 645, 671, 673, 674, 675, 676, 679, 681–2, 691, 692, 695, 696, 697, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 717, 762,
Nizām 'Alī (of Hyderabad), 541, 681, 711
Nizām Bidār-ul-mulk, 352
Nizām Shāh Bahmanī, 346, 354
Nizām (Sikandar) Shāh Lodī, 332, 333, 403, 502
Nīzām Shāhi dynasty, the, 357, 464, 468, 504
Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad, 276, 307, 309, 310, 331, 434, 573
Nizām-ud-dīn Auliyā, 407
Nizām-ul-mulk Āsaf Jāh, 522, 524, 529, 530, 531, 538, 539, 642, 674, 681
Nizām-ul-mulk Barhi, 354
Nizām-ul-mulk Shāhi, 464, 638
Nizām-ul-mulk Sultān (of Ahmadnagar), 468
Nizāmasgar irrigation project, 928
Nizāmat Adālat, Court of, 818
Noakhāli, 980
Noer, Friedrich von, 452
Non-Co-operation Movement, 970–5
Non-Violence (*Ahimsā*), 78, 80, 83, 94, 194
Norris, Sir William, 633
North-Eastern Areas (Reorganisation Act), 989
North-Eastern Frontier, the, 895–7
North-West Frontier, the, 446, 466, 486, 741–2, 823–31, 890–1
North-West Frontier Province (West Pakistan), 227, 890, 905, 911, 977, 979, 980, 981
North-Western Provinces (modern United Provinces), the, 423, 782, 796, 813, 844, 845, 869, 891
Northbrook, Lord, 826, 827, 834
Northern Frontier States, the, 895–7
Northern Sarkars, the, 645, 659, 661, 675, 678, 681, 717, 794
Norway, 949
Nott, Sir William, 749, 750, 751, 752
Nowgong district, 381
Nuniz, 362, 365, 370, 373, 375, 376
Nūr Jahān, 457–9, 461–3, 380, 572, 584
Nūr-ud-dīn (the Turk), 278
Nūr-ud-dīn Muhammad Jahāngīr, *see* Jahāngīr
Nushka-i-Dilkushā, the, 472, 574
Nushki, 894
Nusrat Khān Wazīr, 293
Nusarat Shāh (son of Fīrūz Tughluq), 327, 329
Nusrat Shāh (of Gaur), 400, 410
Nusrat Shāh (Nasīb Khān, of Bengal), 340
Nyāya Sūtras, the, 191, 196, 401
Nyāyādhisa, the, 511
Nysa, 62, 63

Ochterlony, Sir David, 698, 715, 720, 726, 731
Oedyar, Rājā (of Mysore), 367
Ohind, 63
Olainãyagam, the, 186
Olcott, Colonel, 876
Omdut-ul-Umara, 683, 712
Omichand, 651, 653, 657
Onesikritos, 79, 126
Opium, 838, 856, 860
Orenburg, 825
Oriental Institutes, 947
Orissa, 54, 150, 157, 189, 181, 182, 184, 189, 195, 296, 321, 336, 340, 342, 354, 355, 361, 363, 377, 397,

415, 437, 438, 446, 532, 565, 626, 630, 642, 647, 665, 695, 783, 794, 820, 861, 865, 901, 906, 910, 914, 925, 984, 985, 991
Oriyās, the, 910, 946
Orme, Robert, 513, 634, 648, 652, 660
Ormuz, 175, 626
Ostend Company, the, 625
Ottawa Trade Agreement, 946, 948
Oudh, 138, 150, 275, 278, 287, 289, 299, 317, 329, 522, 529, 530, 531, 542, 589, 593, 664, 665, 671, 674, 684–9, 695, 711, 713–14, 720, 741, 742, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 772, 773, 774, 796, 833, 835, 836, 845
——, Begams of, 688–9, 753
——, Tenancy Act, 796
Outram, Sir James, 751, 755, 756, 763, 766, 771, 774
Owen, S. J., 694, 712, 714
Oxenden, Sir George, 631
Oxus, river, 380, 422, 467
Oxyrhynchus papyri, the, 136

Pacific Ocean, 15, 390
Pacific Relations Conference (1944), 952
Pacific War, 1027
Padmanābha Datta, 401
Padmāvat, 562
Padmāvatī, 116, 139, 393
Padminī, 294, 395, 574
Pādshah, the, 484
Pādshāhnāmāh, the, 574, 591
Paes, Domingos, 364, 368, 369, 370, 374
Pagan (King of Burma), 726–7
Pāhārpur, 946
Pahlavas (Parthians), 109, 112–13, 125, 134, 137
Painghāt, 471
Painting, medieval, 246
Paithan, 130
Pakistan, 6, 886, 977, 981, 987, 988, 989, 1007, 1008–9, 1010, 1011, 1012, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1026, 1028, 1029
Pakthas, the, 26
Pāl, Bepin Chandra, 967, 968
Pāla dynasty, the, 157–60
Palaeolithic men in India, 9–12
Palakka, 140
Palāmau, 485, 765
Pālas, the, 174, 179, 191, 195, 205, 246, 269; genealogical table, 250
Pāli, 76, 85, 135, 204
Pallavas, the, 110, 128, 164, 165–7, 169, 191, 238–41, 359; genealogical table, 255
——, their art, 238–41, 244
Palmer, Colonel (Resident at Poona), 693
Palmer, Colonel (surrender of Ghaznī), 751
Palmerston, Lord, 745
Palura, 133, 206
Pāmirs, the, 830
Pan-chao, 115
Panch Mahal, the, 582
Pañchālas, the, 39, 40, 54, 67, 74, 88, 89
Pañchamaka, 59
Pañcharātas, the, 194, 198
Pañchavatī, 87
Panchatantra, the, 201
Panchayat, the, 375, 553
Pancha Sheel, 1023, 1025
Pāndavas, the, 240
Pandharpur, 872
Pandia, 86
Pandit, Vijayalakshmi, 966, 1024
Pandit Rāo, the, 511
Pāndua (Fīrūzābād), 320, 324, 328, 335, 336, 338, 402, 410
Pāṇḍus, the, 74, 78, 86, 88–90
Pāṇḍyas, the, 93, 96, 110, 166, 181, 182, 203, 296, 297
Pāngul, 351
Panhālā fort, 507
Paniar, 759
Pāṇini, 52, 66, 79, 87, 134, 156
Pānipat, 577; battles of: first, 420, 421, 422, 427; second, 439, 440; third, 528, 535, 543–6, 668, 728, 741
Paṇis, the, 33
Panjdeh, 829
Panna, 491
Para, 55
Para, Āṭnāra, 86
Pāradas, the, 134
Parāgal Khān, 401
Paragana, the, 433–4, 511, 555
Paraganās, the (of Bengal), 657
Paramahansa Sabhā, the, 871
Paramānanda, 575
Paramāras, the, 175, 180
Paramardideva, 178
Paramātman, 46
Parameśvara (the Kavindrai), 401
Paramountcy, 982*ff*
Parāśara, 86
Parāśara Smriti, the, 396
Parashurām Trimbak, 516–17
Parenda, 468, 473
Parihars, the, *see* Pratihāras
Parikshit, 40, 86, 89
Parinirvāna, the, 56, 59, 83, 93
Parishā, the, 186

Parishad, the, 188
Parjanya, 37, 77
Parliament, the British, 683, 811, 813, 830, 840, 844, 847, 878, 899–913 *passim*. *See also* House of Commons
Parliament of Religions, the, 875
Parsīs, the, 451, 939
Parsojī, 701
Pārśva, 81
Partapur, 1014
Pārthasārathi Miśra, 401
Parthians, the, 111, 112–13
Parva Gupta, 155
Pārvatī Parinaya, the, 401
Parwez, Prince, 460, 461, 463
Pāśupati, and Pāśupatas, 46, 79, 127, 195, 196
Pāṭaligrāma, 57–8
Pātaliputra, 58, 59, 72, 76, 81, 86, 92, 94, 95, 101, 103, 106, 107–8, 122, 126, 127, 130, 131, 139, 142, 143, 157, 158, 160, 190–1, 219, 946
Patan (Nepāl), 383, 565
Paṭañjali, 5, 78, 86, 109, 127, 132, 134
Patel, Sardar, 983–4
Pathān Kings, Chronicles of the, 272, 278, 301
Pathāns, the, 288, 487, 700, 716, 719, 722, 833, 865
——, Delhi, 276
Pāthrī, 358
Patiālā, 984, 991; Maharaja of, 844
Patiālī, 281, 330
Patna, 422, 445, 446, 493, 521, 563, 565, 567, 591, 593, 630, 662, 663, 664, 716, 769, 790, 791, 793, 919
—— University, 943
Patriotic Association, Muhammadan, 885
Patta, 442
Pattala, 63, 76
Patwāri, the, 555
Pauravas (Pūrus), the, 25, 26, 27, 40, 62, 78
Pāvā, 57, 80
Pavanadūta, the, 180
Pawars, the, 539
Payendah Khān, 742
Peacock Throne, the, 481, 526, 589
Pearl Mosque (Āgra), 481
Peddana, poet laureate, 372
Peel, Lord, 925
Pegu, 368, 723, 724, 727, 831
Pehoa, 160, 161
Pelsaert, François, 559, 560, 564, 565, 566, 567
Penang, 628
Penar (Penner), river, 167, 680
Penugondā, 367
Percy, Lord Eustace, 925
Pericles, 178
Periplus, the, 202, 205
Permanent Settlement, the, 792, 795, 803, 809, 851
Perron, General, 709
Persepolitan Bell, the, 219
Persia, 168, 178, 203, 268, 284, 314, 316, 328, 347, 352, 357, 358, 361, 369, 387, 390, 393, 394, 402, 403, 414, 418, 437, 447, 450, 461, 464, 466, 488, 489, 497, 524, 525, 526, 539, 548, 570, 589, 591, 626, 629, 730, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 753, 767, 799, 823, 824, 825, 826, 894–5
Persian Architecture and Art, 395, 413, 579 *sqq*.
—— language, 809, 810, 811
—— literature, 309–10, 321, 333, 348, 428; in Turko-Afghān era, 402–3; in Mughal era, 424, 459, 474, 559, 571–7
Persian Gulf, 391, 631, 800, 891, 894–5
Perso-Arabic system (Mughul government), the, 547
Peruschi, 552
Peshāwār, 115, 116, 173, 269, 487, 494, 527, 529, 732, 739, 742, 743, 745, 746, 747, 890
Peshwā, 504, 511, 515, 536, 537, 538, 540, 694, 696, 697, 703, 711, 721, 761, 888
Pharro, 134
Phayre, Sir Arthur, 725, 727, 735
Philip II (of Spain), 287, 311
Philippos, 91
Pīndarīs, the, 700, 701, 717–18, 719, 724
Piṅgala, 52
Pipphalivana, 92
Pir Muhammad, 440, 441
Pishin district, 828
Pishtapura, 140, 168
Pithapuram, 140
Pitt, Thomas, 632
Pitt, William, 687, 698, 780; his India Act, 678, 682, 780, 781, 782, 786
Planning Commission, 956
Plassey, battle of, 546, 570, 654–6, 657, 658, 661, 662, 664, 667, 800, 803
Plato, 535
Plebiscite Front, 989
Pliny, 121, 130, 203, 804
Plutarch, 92
Pocock, Admiral Sir George, 658, 660
Podgorny, 1025
Pokarna, 139, 140
Pokharan, 139
Poland, 953

Police, the: Mughul, 551; British Indian, 793, 853; modern Police and Jails, 918, 920–1
Poligars, the, 795
Pollock, Sir George, 751, 752
Polo, Marco, 183, 185, 187, 386
Polybius, 103
Pondicherry, 191, 636, 637, 639, 700, 701, 702, 804, 999
Poona, 504, 507, 510, 542, 545, 668, 669, 670, 672, 673, 684, 691, 693, 700, 701, 702, 804, 930, 945, 948
—— Pact, 975
—— Treaty of, 701
Poor Law Bill, New, 813
Popham, Captain, 670
Population of India (Census of 1961), 6
Poros (Paurava king), 62, 63, 64, 65, 132
Portfolio System, the, 843
Porto Novo, 676
Portugal, 990
Portuguese, the, 346, 347, 364, 377, 427, 438, 445, 447, 448, 450, 464, 465, 486, 510, 512, 514, 539, 570, 623–5, 626, 627, 629, 634
Post Office, the, 856
Post-War Reconstruction Committee, 955
Potdār, the, 555
Pottinger, Eldred, 744, 750
Prabhākara, 198
Prabhākaravardhana, 148, 149–50, 151, 171
Prabhāvatī, 142, 165
Prāchīn Kāmarupī Nritya Sangha, the, 948
Prāchyas, the, 53
Pradyota, 55, 59
Pradyumna-abhyudaya, the, 401
Prague, 1015
Prajāpati, 25, 36, 37, 46
Prākṛit, 7
Pralhād Nirājī, 517
Prant, the, 511
Prārthanā Samāj, the, 871–3, 938
Prasād, Babu Rājendra, 980, 991
Prasād, Rānā, 437
Prasenajit, 55, 57, 58
Pratāp (of Mewār), 443, 444, 459
Pratāp Rudra Kalyān, the, 401
Pratāp Simha, 702
Pratāp Singh, Rājā (of Mainpurī), 332
Pratapā Rudradevea I, 295, 296, 297,
Pratāpāditya, 446
Pratāparudra, 379
Pratāpgarh, 506, 720
Pratihāras, the, 157, 158, 160–3, 169, 172, 173, 174, 175, 189, 267, 269; genealogical table, 249
Pratinidhi, the, 536
Pratishṭhāna, 109
Pravāhana-Jaivali, 40
Prayāga, 116, 150, 152
Pre-historic India, 9–23
Premavārtikā, the, 575
Presidency College, Calcutta, 811
Presidency Towns, 853–5
Press Regulations, 1817, 808; Vernacular Press Act, 880
Prinsep, H.T., 700, 720, 722
Prisons, *see* Police
Pṛithivī, 36, 37, 50
Prithvirāj, 269, 270, 272
Prithvirāja III, 178, 179
Privy Council, the, 797, 819
Privy Purses, 1001
Priyadarśana (Aśoka), 83
Proclamation of 1858, the Queen's, 775
Prolarāja II, 182
Prolaya Nāyaka, 318
Prome, 725, 726, 728
Prophet, the Great (Mahomet), 171, 550
Provincial Autonomy, 823, 907, 910
Provincial Civil Service, the, 849
Provincial Councils, 785, 788, 844
Provincial Courts of Appeal, 793
Ptolemy, 89, 113, 206
Ptolemy II, Philadelphos, 98
Public Debt of India, 900
Public Instruction, Committee of, 811–12
Public Services: (1858–1905), 847–50 (1906–37), 917–19
Public Works, and Communications, 887, 926–7
Pudukottai, 167, 246
Puhar, 202
Pulakeśin I, 167
Pulakeśin II, 150, 160, 165, 166, 167, 168, 171, 182, 200
Pulicat, 626, 627, 629, 676
Pulindas, the, 40
Puṇḍra-nagara, 96
Puṇḍras, the, 40, 53, 87
Puṇḍravardhana, 96
Punjab, the, 91, 111, 155, 173, 174, 204, 267, 268, 269, 270, 273, 275, 276, 278, 279, 282, 283, 287, 292, 312, 315, 329, 418, 419, 420, 423, 426, 431, 446, 457, 475, 487, 492, 522, 525–9 *passim*, 535, 541, 542, 546, 563, 671, 674, 702, 729, 732, 737, 738–41, 744, 747, 749, 759, 768, 769, 770, 771, 796, 798, 804,

823, 831, 846, 864, 866, 868, 873, 878, 879, 885, 897, 914, 915, 920, 924, 943, 944, 960, 981, 987, 989, 990, 991, 999, 1000, 1002, 1005
——Tenancy Act, 796
Punjābi, 400
Pūran Mal, 432
Purāna Qil'ā, the, 578
Purāṇas, the, 58, 59, 60, 102, 103, 104, 107, 108, 109, 191, 195, 200, 873
Purandhar, 508
——, Treaty of, 669
Puri, 196, 237
Purnea, 647, 649
Purohita, the, 28, 187
Purosottama Gajapati, Rājā, 362, 377
Puru Gupta, 144
Pūrus, the (Pauravas), 25, 26, 27, 28, 40, 62, 78
Purushapura, 115. *See* Peshāwār
Purushottama, 451
Purva Mīmāṁsa (*Karma Mīmāṁsa*), 198
Pusa Agricultural Research Institute, 928
Pūshān, 37
Pushkalāvatī, 62, 63, 65
Pushkarana, 139
Pushpapura, 139. *See* Pāṭaliputra
Pushyabhūtī, the house of, 144, 148, 149–50, 156; genealogical table, 249
Pushyagupta (the *Vaiśya*), 106, 122
Pushyamitra, 192, 195
Pushyamitra Śuṅga, 102, 104, 107, 108, 132, 134, 141
Pushyamitras, the, 143, 146

Qadam Rasūl, the, 341, 411
Qadian, 940
Qādir Shāh (Mallū Khān), 344
Qadr Khān, 335
Qandahār, 94, 426, 437, 447, 458, 461, 466, 467, 471, 485, 487, 524, 527, 568, 584, 747, 748, 749, 750, 823, 827, 828
Qansauh-al-Ghaurī, 346
Qanungo, Dr., 428*n*, 435, 474
Qānūngoes, the, 554, 784, 786
Qāsim 'Alī Khān, 465
Qāsīm Barīd-ul-Mamālik, 356
Qāsim Khān, 475, 476, 624
Qāzī 'Abdul Muqtadir Shāhnini, 403
Qāzī 'Alā-ul-mulk, 293–4
Qāzī Mughīs-ud-dīn, 298–9
Qazi-ul-Qazat, the, 386, 550, 552
Qazis, the, 435, 552–3
Qil'a-i-Kuhna Masjid, the, 578
Qizilbāshis, the, 749
Queens-regnant (Gupta), 189
Quetta, 827, 894
Quilon, 296, 297
Quinton, J.W., 835
Quli Qutb Shāh, 358, 379
Quran, the, 501, 516
Quranic Law, 323, 324, 384, 386, 489, 552
Qutb Khān, 332
Qutb Minār, the, 235, 277, 302, 407
Qutb Shāhī dynasty (of Golkundā), the, 357, 358, 379, 498
Qutb-ud-dīn (of Bengal), 458
Qutb-ud-dīn (of Kāshmīr), 347
Qutb-ud-dīn Ahmad (of Gujarāt), 345
Qutb-ud-dīn Aībak, 178, 270–1, 273–4, 275, 277, 293
Qutlugh Khān, 395
Qutlugh Khwāja, 291

Races of India, the, 13–14
Radcliffe, Sir Cyril, 981
Rādhā, 575
Rādhā Kānta Deb, Rājā, 819
Rādhākrishnan, Sir S., 947, 1024, 1027
Radhakrishnan Commission, 963, 964
Rafī-ud-Darajāt, 521
Rafī-ud-daulah, 521
Rafī-us-Shān, 520, 521, 522
Raghoba, 681
Raghūjī Bhonsle, 539
Raghūjī Bhonsle II, 695, 696, 697, 700, 701, 702
Raghunandan, 396, 401
Raghunāth Rao, 528, 541, 542, 668, 669, 670
Rāhula, 82
Rāi, Lājpat, 968, 977
Rāichūr, 363
—— Doāb, the, 353, 361, 362, 363
Raidas, 399
Rāigarh, 488, 499, 510, 516
Railways, Indian, 838, 856, 863, 887, 926–7, 951
Rainier, Admiral Peter, 710
Rāisin, 432
Rāj Singh, Rānā (of Mewār), 460, 495, 497
Rājā, Rājan, the, 28-9, 67, 71, 87
Rājā-guru, the, 187
Rajab, 319
Rājagṛiha (Rājgir), 57, 58, 72, 82, 84, 90
Rājāhmundry, 354, 645, 659
Rājanyas, the, 31
Rājarāja (Chola), 170, 180, 242
Rājārām (son of Shivājī), 499, 500, 516, 517, 537, 539
Rājaśekhara, 161, 201
Rājasiṁha (Narasiṁhavarman) II, 167
Rājasthān, 984, 985, 991

Rājasthān, Tod's, 720
Rājasuya rite, the, 41, 86, 89
Rājatarangiṇī, the, 201, 348
Rājballabh, 561, 647, 648, 649
Rājendra Chola I, 159, 170, 181, 214, 243
Rājedra Chola III, Kulottuṅga I, 181
Rājgarh fort, 505, 508
Rājmahal, 5, 446, 475, 563, 649
Rājputāna, 172, 187, 238, 287, 345, 441, 479, 520, 541, 591, 593, 698, 699, 716, 719–21, 741, 769, 861, 862
Rājputs, the, 174, 183, 185, 189, 200, 269, 278, 281, 291, 293, 294, 295, 344, 346, 379, 389, 395, 418, 420, 421, 422, 425, 427, 432, 437, 441, 442, 443, 444, 451, 459, 465, 476, 533, 534, 540, 542, 589, 594, 672, 699, 701, 702, 718, 816, 836, 985; the Rājput War, 494–7
Rajshahi, 870
Rājyamatī, 154
Rājyapāla Pratihāra, 162, 174
Rājyaśri, 148, 149, 189
Rājyavardhana, 148, 149, 156
Rāksas, 366
Rākshasas, the, 87
Raleigh, Sir Thomas, 943
Rām, Rājā (Jāt), 490
Rām Nārāyan, 662
Rām Singh, Rājā, 476, 493
Rāma, story of, 85–8; worship of, 574–5
Rama Charita, the, 201
Rāma Gupta, 141
Rāma Rāya (Āravīdu), 365, 366, 367, 372
Rāmachandra, 182
Rāmakrishna Mission, the, 874–6, 938, 942, 1011
Rāmakrishna Paramahansa, 874–6
Raman, Sir C.V., 947
Rāmānanda, 397, 398
Rāmānuja, 195, 198, 201
Rāmapāla, 159, 179
Ramayaṇa, the, 87, 215, 400, 573, 575
Rāmchānd, Rājā, 443
Rāmchandra Pant, 516
Rāmachandradeva (Yādava), 290, 293 295, 296, 297, 298, 503
Rāmcharitamānasa, the, 575
Rāmdās Samarath, Guru, 504, 515, 871
Rāmeśvarām, 243, 298
Rāmgangā, river, 173
Rāmmohan Roy, Rājā, 806–9, 811, 818, 819, 867, 868, 869, 871, 873, 884
Rāmnad, 296
Rāmnagar, 510, 512, 739
Rāmpur, 987
Rāmpurā, 685, 699
Rampurva, 96
Rāmu, 724
Ranade, Madādev Govinda, 505, 512, 872, 877, 884
Ranade, Ramābāi, 940, 941
Ranasūra, 159
Ranchi, 955
Ranchordās Jodha, 495
Ranga II, 367
Ranga III, 367
Rangīr, 473
Rangoon, 523, 724, 726, 727, 771, 831, 917, 919, 976
—— University, 943
Ranikhet, 716
Ranjit Singh, 515, 729–34, 743, 745, 746, 747, 749, 753, 754
Ranjur Singh Majhithia, 736
Ranmal, 294
Ranoji Sindhia, 539
Ranthambhor, 271, 273, 276, 289, 293, 294, 443, 444
Rāo, Sir Dinkar, 760, 769, 773, 834, 841
Rao, V.K.R.V., 1021
Rāo Sāheb, 766
Raor, 172
Ras Khān, 575
Rās-panchadhyāyī, the, 575
Rāshṭra, the, 168, 188
Rāshṭrakūṭas, the, 157, 158, 159, 161, 168–70, 179, 180, 195, 243, 244; genealogical table, 253
Rasul, A., 967
Ratan Singh, Rānā, 294, 344
Rathas (temples), 167, 239
Rāthors, the, 432, 476, 487, 494, 495, 496, 497
Ratipāla (general), 294*n*
Raushnārā, 474
Rāvaṇa, 87
Raverty, Major, H.G., 271, 276, 278, 288, 317
Rāvī, river, 26, 328, 535, 564, 739, 864
Ravikīrti, 200
Ravivarman (Kerala), 296
Ravivarman, Prince, 401
Rāwalpindi, 892, 1013, 1014
Rawlinson, H.G., 510, 515, 750
Rawlinson, Lord, 922
Ray, Sir, P.C., 947
Ray, Mrs. Renuka, 966
Rayamalla, 381
Raymond, François de, 674, 709
Razakars, 985, 986

Raziyya, Queen, 277
Razm-Nāmah, the, 573
Razvi, Syed Kasim, 985, 986
Read, Colonel Alexander, 794
Reading, Lord, 838
Red Sea, 202, 203, 346, 447, 623, 629, 631, 710, 800, 953
Reddis, the Telegu, 168
Rees, Sir. J.D., 894
Reform Bill (English), 813
Reforms, epoch of, 823
Registrars, the, 791
Regulating Act, 777, 778, 780, 782, 789
Rehman, Mujibur, 1011, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1017, 1018
Religion: in Vedic times, 36–8, 46; in Magadhan era, 77–85; in Mauryan era, 132–4; in Gupta era, 192–200; in Turko-Afghān era, 393–400; in Modern India, 867–77
Religious Disabilities Act (1856), 766
Religious and Social Reform, 867–77, 938–42
Rennell, James, 564
Revenue administration: Bengal (1765–93), 748–8, 788, 790, 791; Madras (1829–58), 794–5; Mughul, 553–6
Revolutionary War, European, 692
Rewārī, 436, 536
Rhosan Akhtar, *see* Muhammad Shāh (of Delhi)
Richelieu, Cardinal, 635
Ṛig-Veda, the, 13, 22, 25–38 *passim*, 43, 50, 51
Ṛig-Vedic age, the, 24–38
Ṛik-Samhitā, the, 28, 35, 47, 50
Ripaud, Lieut., 705
Ripon, Lord, 707, 828, 851, 852, 853, 916
Rita, 36
Road Development, Indian, 927
Robat Kila, 894
Roberts, Lord, 828
Roberts, P.E., 685, 702, 708, 734, 750, 780
Roe, Sir Thomas, 458, 480, 629
Rohilkhaṇḍ (Ruhelkhand), 139, 140, 150, 281, 522, 684–6, 717
Rohtak, 536
Rohtās (Bihār), 430, 462
Roman coins, 203
Rome and Roman Empire, 130, 135, 203, 204, 227, 338, 804, 950
Ronaldshay, Lord, 917
Rooper, 732
Rose, Sir Hugh, 772
Roshniyas, the, 447
Round Table Conference, the, 907, 908, 941, 973, 974, 975
Rourkela, 955
Rowlatt Act, the, 971
Roy, Rāi Bahādur S.C., 947
Royal Air Force, 900, 923, 949, 951
Royal Indian Navy, 923, 951, 978
Royal Military College, Sandhurst, 923
Rudra (Śiva), 37, 46
Rudradāman I, 109, 113, 131, 137
Rudradeva, 139
Rudrammā Devi, 182, 185, 290
Rudrasena II, 142, 165
Rudravarman, 207
Rūh Parwar Āghā, 351
Ruhelā Afghāns, the, 522, 542
—— War, 684–6
Ruhelkhand, *see* Rohilkhaṇḍ
Ruhut (Rāhib), river, 173
Rukn-ud-dīn Shaikh, 309, 317
Rukn-ud-dīn Fīrūz, 277–8
Rukn-ud-dīn Ibrāhim, 291
Rum, 357
Rumania, 953
Rumbold, Sir Thomas, 681
Rūmī Khān, 427
Rummindeī Pillar, 82, 96
Rupa Goswamī, 401
Rupamatī, 393, 413
Rupnagar, 477
Ruqayyā Begam, 481
Rural Indebtedness and Reconstruction, 930–1
Russell, Sir John, 930
Russell, W.H., 776
Russia, 723, 732, 743, 744, 745, 746, 823–33, 857, 891, 892, 893–6, 952, 966, 967, 970
Russian Turkestān, 825
Russo-Afghān Boundary, 829
—— Turkish War, 827
Ryot, the, 555
Ryotwārī Settlement, the, 794, 795, 796
Ryswick, Treaty of, 635

Sa'ādat 'Alī, 689
Sa'ādat Khān (of Oudh), 532
Sābājī Sindhia, 542
Sabarmati Ashram, 974
Sabhā, the, 29, 42, 68
Sabhāsad Bakhar, the, 513
Sabhyas, the, 184, 186
Sabuktigīn, 172–3, 175, 268, 269
Sachiva, the, 186, 511
Sadar Amīns, the, 793, 794, 919
Sadar Diwāni Adālat, the, 788, 789, 793, 796, 797, 919

Sadar Nizāmat Adālat, the, 788, 790, 796, 919
Sadar-us-Sudūr, the, 550, 553
Sadāshiv Rāo Bhāo, 541, 542, 543, 545
Sadāsiva Rāya, 365
Sādhāram Brāhma Samāj, the, 870
Sadhaurā, 534
Sadler, Sir Michael, 943
Sadozāis, the, 742
Sadr, the, 435
Sa'dullah Khān, 466, 467, 523
Safavī Empire, the, 418
Safdar 'Alī, 638
Safdar Jang, 531, 674
Saffarids, the, 267
Sāgar, 316
Sagauli, Treaty of, 715
Sahadeva, 88
Sahajāti, 76
Sāhasāṅka, the new, *see* Vikramāditya, the
Saheṭh-Maheṭh, 55, 72
Sāhib Subah, the, 556
Sāhibjī, 487
Sahitya Akademi, 964
Sahyadrī range, the, 503
Saif-ud-daulah, 674
Saif-ud-dīn, 268
Saif-ud-dīn Firūz, 338
Saif-ud-dīn Muhammad, 269
Śailendras, the, 212, 14
St. Lubin, Chevalier de, 669, 709
St. Thomas, *see* San Thomé
Śaiśunāgas, the, 56–9, 60
Śaiva Nāyanārs, 167
Śaivism, 114, 115, 116, 192, 193–6, 200, 210, 242, 360, 372, 397. *See also* Śiva
Sakala (Sialkot), 107, 111, 146, 269
Śākas, the, 89, 109, 112–13, 114, 125, 128, 134, 137, 141, 142, 174, 181, 393
Śakasthāna (Sistān), 112, 826, 894
Sāketa, 72, 108, 115, 116
Sakhar Kheda, 531
Sakhārām Bāpu, 541
Sakhīs, the, 400
Śakra, 78
Sakrigalī, 430
Śaktism, 20, 21, 194
Śakuntalā, 90
Śākya-muni, 82, 97
Śākyas, the, 55, 58, 72, 80, 82
Salabat Jang, Nizām, 659
Śālaṅkāyanas, the, 110, 164
Salar Jang, Sir, 769, 773
Salbai, Treaty of, 670, 671, 672
Saldi, 291
Sale, Sir Robert, 735, 750, 751
Salīm, (son of Akbar), 449, 450. *See also* Jahāngīr
Salimā Begam, Sultānā, 450, 572
Salīmgarh, 477
Salimulla, Nawāb, 968
Salisbury, Lord, 827, 829, 880
Śāliśūka, 102, 103
Śālivāhana, 109
Salsette, 510, 539, 624, 669, 670
Salt monopoly, 838, 856, 882
Sāluva dynasty, the, 362
Sāluva Narasiṁha, 377
Sāluva Timma, 363
Salween, 724, 727
Samāchāradeva, 156
Sāmāna, 282, 292, 319, 329
Samanids, the, 172
Sāmanta Sena, 179
Samarqānd, 328, 419, 467, 623, 823, 825, 828
Samarsi, 381
Samataṭa, 96, 140
Sambalpur, 761
Śambara, 27
Sambhal, 426, 577
Śambhu, 193
Saṁgrāmarāja, 155, 173
Saṁhitās, the, 33, 47, 50, 51
Samiti, the, 29, 42
Samkīrtan, the, 870
Samprati, *or* Sampadi, 102, 132
Saṁsāra, doctrine of, 79, 80, 83
Samudra Gupta, 56, 113, 138–41, 142, 152, 164, 165, 184, 185, 186, 198, 200
Samūgarh, 476, 477
Samvat, 505
San Thomé (Madras), 113, 624, 635, 640
Sanads of adoption, 834
Sanakānīkas, the, 140, 142
Sāñchī, 221, 223, 224, 227, 228, 230, 236
Sāndhivigrahika, the, 186
Sandhyākara, 160, 201
Sandila, 329
Sanga Rānā (of Mewār), 344, 395, 396, 418, 419, 420, 421, 442
Sāngala, 65
Sangama (of Vijayanagar), 359
——, dynasty of, 360, 361
Sangameshwar, 353, 354, 516
Sangeet Natak Akademi, 964
Śankarāchārya, 90, 196, 198, 201
Śaṅkaradeva, 290, 298
Śaṅkaravarman, 155, 162
Saṅkarshaṇa, 132, 134
Sanskrit, 7, 119, 175, 200, 201, 204, 206, 210, 215, 321, 337, 348, 371,

377, 394, 400, 401, 571, 810, 811, 812, 870
—— College, Dhāra, 191
Santājī Ghorpade, 517
Sāntāl Parganās, the, 548, 765
Śāntideva, 201
Santiniketan, 963
Sapru, Sir Tej Bahādur, 908, 944
—— Committee, 932, 944
Sapta Sindhu, the, 27
Saran, Prof. Paramatma, 428
Sarasvatī, 26, 37, 127
Sārdā, Rāi Saheb Harbilās, 940
Sardār Khān Singh, 738
Sardesai, 508, 512
Sardeshmukhī, 512, 537, 674
Sardha-Oudh canals, the, 928
Safarāz Khān, 532, 647
Sarhind, *see* Sirhind
Sarkar, the, 433, 555
Sarkar, Sir J.N., 467, 472, 474, 476, 478, 480, 486, 488, 498, 499, 507, 512, 517, 523, 535, 542, 545, 548, 551, 553, 703
Sārnāth, 82, 101, 219, 221, 233, 946
Sarvādhikārin, the, 186
Sarvar-ul-mulk, 331
Sarvārthachintaka, the, 186
Śarvavarman, 134
Śarvavarman Maukhari, 148
Śaśāṅka, 148, 150, 156, 196
Sasarām, 428, 429, 435, 578
Śaśigupta, 65
Sassanian dynasty, the, 116
Śāstra Dīpikā, the, 401
Śāstras, the, 68, 806
Śāstri, Srinivāsa, 908, 938
Satadhunus, 102
Śātakarnis (Chutukulānanda), the, 164
Śātakarnis (Sātavāhaṇa,) the, 109, 110, 164
Sātārā, 143, 510, 517, 638, 702, 761, 833
Sātavāhana dynasty, the, 109–10, 113, 124, 125, 128, 131, 137, 164, 201
Sātgāon, 312, 335, 464, 465, 568
Sathe, Ramchandra Dattatreya, 954
Satī, 71–2, 190, 294, 370, 393, 395, 489, 561, 766, 807, 816–9
Satiyaputra, 96
Satnāmīs, the, 491
Sātpurā range, the, 343, 503
Satrap, the, 124
Śatrunjaya, 175, 195
Satvats, the, 53
Sātyaki, 168
Satyapīr, the, 394
Satyārtha Prakās, Dayānanda's, 873
Saubhūti, 62
Saugor, 772
Saunders, Thomas, 643
Saurāshtra, 984, 985, 991
Sauvīrā, 77
Savanur, 675
Śavaras, the, 40, 74
Śavarasvāmin, 198
Savitṛi, 37, 90
Sawad (Swāt), 190, 347, 447
Sawai Jay Singh II, 535
Sayajī Rāo Gaikwār, 834
Sāyana, 360, 371, 401
Sayani, 884
Sayūrghāl lands, the, 553
Sayyid Jamāl-ud-dīn Urfī, 573
Sayyid Maqbar 'Ālī, 571
Sayyids, the, 330–2 334, 386, 407, 521, 522, 524, 530, 533; genealogical tables, 597, 599
School Book Society, the, 812
Science: in Vedic age, 35, 47 52; Modern Indian, 947
Scott, Colonel W., 713
Sculpture: early schools of, 236; Gandhāra school, 227–33; Gupta period, 233–6; Medieval, 246. *See also* Art *and* Monuments
Scythians, the, 112–13, 114, 118, 137, 228
Scytho-Parthian Kings, the, 112–13
Seal, Sir B. N., 947
Secretary of State for India, 823, 838–67 *passim*, 899–913 *passim*, 922, 949
Secunderābād 986,
Sedaseer, 705
Seistān, 112, 826
Seistān Mission, 894
Seleukos, 93, 101, 111, 117
Seleukos Nikator, 94, 103
Selim Shāh (Islam Shāh Sher), 436, 553
Seljuqs, the, 268
Sen, Dr., 512, 561
Senā Karte, the, 536
Senāpati, the, 511, 539, 835
Senas, the, 160, 179, 195, 246, 269; genealogical table, 251
Senateova, the, 375
Sepoy Army, the, 767, 768, 774, 865
Sepoys, female, 674*n*[1]
Sera, 674
Serāmpur, 818
Seringapatam (Srirangapatan), 367, 541, 678, 680, 705, 707, 712
——, Treaty of, 680, 837
Servants of India Society, the, 938, 939, 945
Seths, the, 187

Seton, Alexander, 730
Sevā Sadan Societies, the, 941–2
Sevā Samiti, the, 939
——, Boy Scout, 939
Seven Years' War, 646, 652, 658, 661
Sewell, Robert, 359, 361, 364, 366
Shādī Khān, 303, 337
Shafi, Sir Mohammad, 908
Shāh Beg, 448
Shāh Buland Iqbāl, 467
Shāh Husain (governor of Sind), 437
Shāh Isma'il Safavī of Persia, 419
Shāh Jahān, 358, 448, 449, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 483, 485, 493, 498, 501, 504, 547, 548, 549, 552, 554, 555, 558, 560, 564, 565, 567, 571, 574, 575, 584, 586, 589, 593, 594
Shāh-Jahānnāmāh, the, 574
Shāh Lodī, Sultān (Islām Khān Lodī), 332
Shāh Mirzā (Shams-ud-dīn Shāh), 347
Shāh Rukh, 330
Shāh Shujā, 732, 743, 746, 747, 748, 749, 751, 754
Shāh Turkān, 277*n*
Shāh Walī Khān, 544, 545
Shāhābād, 717, 818
Shahana-i-Mandi, the, 301
Shāhbād (village), 302*n*[3]
Shāhdara, 462
Shāhi Khān (Zain-ul-'Ābidīn), 347, 394, 395
Shāhiya dynasty, the, 155, 162, 172–4, 178, 180
Shāhjī (father of Shivājī), 469, 470, 504, 505, 712
Shāpurī, 724
Shahr-i-nau, 488
Shāhrānpur, 728
Shahryār, 459, 461, 463
Shāhū (son of Rājārām), 500
Shāhū (Shivājī II), 516, 517, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540
Shaibāni Khān Uzbeg, 419
Shāista Khān, 486, 507, 632, 635
Shām Singh, 736
Shambhūjī, 496, 498, 499, 508, 509, 516
Shambhūjī II, 517*n*, 538
Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afif, 320, 322, 323, 325, 326, 326*n*[3], 403
Shams Khān (of Gujarāt), 345
Shams Khān Auhadi, 329
Shams-ud-dīn Abu Nasar Muzaffar Shāh (Sīdī Badr), 339
Shams-ud-dīn Ahmad (Ganesh), 337
Shams-ud-dīn Dāūd (Bahmanī), 351
Shams-ud-dīn Fīrūz Shāh, 308
Shams-ud-dīn Iliyās Shāh (Hājī Iliyās), 320, 321, 336
Shams-ud-din Shāh (Shah Mirzā, of Kāshmīr), 347
Shams-ud-dīn Yūsuf Shāh, 339
Shankarajī Malhar, 516
Shāns, the, 382, 833
Sharaf Qāī, 300
Sharb, the, 323
Shariat, the, 284
Sharma, Dasaratha, 505*n*
Sharqī dynasty, the, 338, 340, 342
Shashghani, the, 325
Shastri, Krishna, 363, 364, 374
Shastri, Lal Bahadur, 953, 1009, 1023
Shaukat Jang, 647, 649, 650, 651, 657
Sheoraj, 715
Sher-afghān, 458
Sher 'Ālī, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829
Sher Andāz, 283
Sher Khān Sunqar, 282, 284, 319
Sher Khān Sūr, 341
Sher Muhammad, 756
Sher Shāh, 418, 422. 425, 426, 427–36, 438, 455, 550, 553, 562, 567, 568, 571, 578, 589
Sher Singh, 739, 740, 759
Sheristādār, the Chief, 786
Shiahs, the, 353, 357, 437, 469, 472, 479, 498, 524
Shihāb-ud-dīn (Muhammad of Ghūr), 174, 268–72, 273, 274, 277
Shihāb-ud-dīn (of Kāshmīr), 347
Shihāb-ud-dīn Ahmad, 310, 445
Shihāb-ud-dīn Bāyazīd Shāh, 337
Shihāb-ud-dīn Bughrā Shāh, 308
Shihāb-ud-dīn 'Umar, 303
Shipping, 951, 954
Shiqdār-i-Shiqdārān, the, 433
Shiqdārs, the, 388
Shitab Rāy, 783
Shivājī, 488, 491, 496, 498, 503, 504, 505–16, 537, 540, 558, 702, 703, 729, 761, 884
Shivājī II (Shāhū), 536, 537, 538, 539, 540
Shivājī III, 517
Shivner, 505
Sholāpur, 469, 888
Shorāpur, 317
Shore, Sir John (Lord Teignmouth), 671, 674, 682, 683, 689, 692, 708, 742, 786
Shrimati Nathubai Damodar Thackersay Women's University, 963
Shujā (son of Shāh Jahān), 474, 475, 477, 478, 479, 801
Shujā, Sultān, 631
Shujā Mīrzā, 743
Shujā'at Khān, 487

Shujā'at Khān (of Mālwa), 343
Shujā-ud-daulah (of Oudh), 531, 543, 544, 664, 684, 688, 689
Shujā-ud-dīn Khān, 532
Siālkot, 107, 111, 146, 269
Siam, 207, 210, 723
Sibi district, 90, 828
Sibis, the, 62
Siddharāja Jayasiṁha, 175, 181
Siddhārtha (father of Mahāvīra), 80
Siddhārtha (Gautama Buddha), 82, 83
Siddī Maulā, 289
Sīdī Badr (Shams-ud-dīn Abu Nasar Muzaffar Shāh), 339
Sīdī Jauhar, 507
Sikandar (of Gujarāt), 347
Sikandar (of Kāshmīr), 347
Sikandar II (of Bengal), 339
Sikandar 'Ādil Shāhī, 498
Sikandar Jāh, 711
Sikandar Shāh (of Bengal), 321, 336
Sikandar Shāh (Nizām Shāh) Lodī, 332, 333, 340, 403, 502
Sikandar Sūr, 438, 439
Sikandara, 490, 582, 593
Śikharas, 236–8, 241, 242, 244, 245
Sikhism, 399
Sikhs, the, 458, 491–3, 522, 528, 529, 533, 534, 535, 542, 546, 594, 699, 722, 728–41, 743, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 754, 769, 770, 771, 773, 850, 865, 906, 910, 939–40, 980, 987
—— Twelve confederacies of, 728
Sikkim, 716, 761, 895, 897, 1009, 1002–3
Sikrī, 577
Śilabhaṭṭārikā, 200
Śilāditya (Harsha), 148, 149, 150. *See also* Harsha of Kanauj
Siṁhāchalam, 363
Siṁhavarman, 139, 165
Siṁhavishnu, 165
Simla, 716, 752, 969, 1013
Simla Agreement, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017
Simla Conference (1913), 896
Simon, Sir John (Lord Simon), 907
—— Commission, 907, 918, 973
Simrāon (Nepāl), 383
Simuka (Sātāvahana), 109, 131
Sinān, the Albanian, 577
Sind, 15, 23, 73, 111, 113, 150, 151, 168, 171, 172, 267, 275, 276, 278, 282, 287, 317, 318, 319, 321, 322, 329, 346, 391, 432, 437, 438, 447, 475, 479, 526, 528, 566, 722, 732, 735, 744, 747, 753–6, 800, 823, 910, 911, 977, 979
—— Sagar, 276, 529
Sindhi, 1000
Sindhia house of Gwālior, the, 539, 699, 701, 702, 714, 717, 718, 730, 769, 772
Sindhia Mahādājī, 515, 526, 670, 671, 672, 673, 676, 691, 703, 730
Sindhu-Sauvīra, 54
Sindhurāja Navasāhasānka, 174, 175
Singapore, 977
Singhagarh fort, 507
Singhana, 182, 191
Singhasari, 214
Sinha, Lord, 901, 903, 916
Sino-Indian Agreement (1954), 1007
Sipāh Sālār; the, 556
Sipihr Shukoh, 478, 479, 480
Siprī (Sivpur), 670
Sirāj-ud-daulah, 532, 562, 647–54 *passim*, 656, 657, 661, 664, 801
Sirhind, 331, 332, 437, 527, 528, 533, 534, 541, 728
—— Canal, 864
Siri, 302
Sirmur hills, 324
Sirohī, 720
Sironj, 519
Sirsuti, 324
Sisodiās, the, 495, 496, 505
Sist, 375
Sistān, 112, 826, 894
Śiśunāga, 56, 59
Sītā, wife of Rāmā, 87, 88
Sitābaldi, 702
Sittannavasal, temple at, 246
Sittang vally, 724
Siva, 20, 21, 22, 24, 37, 46, 78, 79, 96, 132, 134, 152, 242. *See also* Śaivism.
Siva-Bhāgavatas, 79
Siva Skandavarman, 132, 165
Sivadeva (of Nepāl), 154
Śivas, the, 26, 36
Sivasamuram, 363
Siwalīk, 275
Siwālik Hills, 328, 346, 438
Skanda, 78, 132
Skanda Gupta, 143, 146, 148
Skeen, Sir Andrew, 922
Skylax, 61
Slave dynasty, the, 271, 273–86; genealogical table, 595
Slavery, 126, 191, 326, 334, 337, 354, 393, 465, 526, 568
——, Abolition of, Bills: English, 813, Indian, 820
Sleeman, Sir William, 572, 763, 819
Slim, Gen. (latr Field-Marshal), 950
Smith, Richard Baird, 771
Smith, Sir Harry, 736
Smith, General Joseph, 675

Smith, Dr. Vincent A., 219, 329, 436, 438, 445–6, 452, 454-5, 470, 476, 479–80, 499, 567, 586, 677, 687, 787
Smṛiti, 51
Soares, Mario, 990
Sobhā Singh, 632
Sobraōn, 736
Social conditions: in Vedic age, 29; in Aryan age, 43; Magadhan, 71; in Maurya era, 124, in Gupta era, 188; in Vijayanagar Empire, 369; in Turko-Afghān era, 392; in Mughul era, 559; in modern times, 815–20, 867–77, 938*ff*, 961–6
Social and Religious Reform, 867–77, 938-42
Social Service League, 938
Socotra, 203
Soma, 31, 35, 37, 38, 41
Soma, Princess, 207
Somadeva, 201
Someśvara Āhavamalla, 181
Someśvara III, 181, 185, 201
Somnāth, 173, 175, 752
Sonārgāon, 308, 312, 321, 335, 336, 434, 566, 568
Sondīp, 486
Song Yun, 146
Soonda, 706
Sooty, 664
Sopārā, 76, 96
South Africa, 369, 952
South-East Asia, 1027
Soviet Union, relations with India, 1024–6
Spain, 171, 500, 626, 627, 676
Spalirises, 112
Special Marriage Act, 965
Spice Islands, 625, 627
Śraddhā, 36
Śraddhānanda, Svāmī, 873
Śramaṇas, 122
Śravana Belgola, 244
Śrāvastī, 55, 57, 72, 76, 139, 150
Śreṇika (Bimbisāra), 56
Śrī Harsha, 201
Śrī Meghavarma (-Vaṇṇa), 138
Śrī Prithvī Vallabha, the, 185
Śrī Vaishṇavas, the, 185
Śrī Vikrama, 248
Śri Yajña Śātakarṇi, 109
Srikara Nandī, 401
Srinagar, 987
Sringeri, 196
Śriñjayas, the, 25, 26, 40, 88, 89
Śrīpur, 568
Śrīrangam, 198, 243, 644
Śrīrangapatan, *see* Seringapatam
Śrong-tsan Gampo, 205
Sruti, 47, 51
State lotteries, 820
Statesman, The, 950
Statutory Civil Servants, 849, 880
Stavorinus, 564
Steel Corporation of Bengal, 951
Stein, Sir Aurel, 204
Stephen, Sir James, 779
Stephenson, Edward, 633
Stewart, Sir Donald Martin, 828
Stolietoff, General, 827
Strabo, 78, 126, 127, 131, 132
Strachey, Sir John, 685, 856
Strachey, Sir Richard, 861, 932
Strougal, Lubomir, 953
Stuart, General James, 677, 705
Stuarts, the, 627
Stupas, 221, 224 229–31
Subah, the, 449, 555
Subahdār (or *Nāzim*),the, 556
Subandhu, 200
Subansiri, river, 381
Subbarayan, Mrs. Radhabai, 966
Subhadrā, 89
Subhāgasena, 103, 108
Subject Peoples Conference (1945), 952
Subordinate Civil Service, 849
Sudan, 953
Sudarśana lake, 122
Sudās, 26, 27
Suddha-advaita, 397
Suddhi movement, the, 873
Suddhodana, 82
Sūdra caste, the, 31, 44, 68, 74, 125, 171, 188
Suevi, the, 130
Suez Canal, 848, 886, 933, 949
Suffren, Admiral de, 676, 709
Sūfī, Shaikh, 481
Sūfīsm, 398, 450, 454, 474
Sugandhā, 155
Sugrīva, 87
Suhenpha, 382
Sujan Rāi Khatri, 574
Sukkur Barrage, 928
Sulaimān (Arab merchant), 161, 185
Sulaimān Kararānī, 445
Sulaimān the Magnificent, 418
Sulaimān Shukoh, 475, 478, 479
Śūlikas, the, 148
Sultānates, independent: Jaunpur, 341–2; Mālwa, 342–4; Gujarāt, 344–7; Kāshmīr, 347–8; Khāndesh, 348–9; the Bahmanī Kingdom, 349–57; of the Deccan, 357–9
Sultānganj, 235
Sultānpur, 308. *See* Warangal
Sumant, the, 511

Sumatra, 158, 206, 212, 215, 233, 625, 628
Sumerian civilisation, 21, 23
Sunām, 282, 319
Sunda, 674
Sundara Pāndya, 297
Sundaramūrti, 196
Sunderman, 953
Śuṅgas, the, 102, 107–9, 192, 224
Sunnīs, the, 353, 451, 475, 488, 524
Sūpa, 449
Supreme Council, the, 788, 808
Supreme Court, the, 789, 790, 797, 798, 818, 919, 993
Sūra, 31
Sura Chandra, 835
Sūraj Mal Jāt, 535, 543
Surajgarh, 429
Surapāla, 158
Śūras, the, 158, 179
Śūrasena (Mathurā), 54
Śūrasenas, the, 79, 132
Surāshṭra, 54, 93, 122, 162, 172
Surāt, 344, 445, 466, 470, 507, 510, 513, 516, 533, 534, 567, 568, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 634, 636, 669, 695, 712, 720, 760, 800, 968
——, Treaty of, 669
Surdās, 575
Surjana Hara, Rāi, 443
Surji-Arjangāon, Treaty of, 697
Surmā valley, 897
Surman, John, 633
Śūrpāraka (Sopārā), 76, 96
Sūrs, the, 427, 437, 438, 445, 547, 553, 562, 564; genealogical table, 603
Sūrya, 24, 37
Sūryavarman II (of Kambuja), 207
Susa, 122
Suśruta, 135
Śuśunia inscription, 139
Sutanutī, 632
Sūtās, the, 68
Sutlej, river, 282, 323, 478, 534, 715, 720, 722, 736, 737, 759, 768, 928
Sūtras, the, 51, 52, 67, 72
Suvarṇabhūmi, 206
Suvarṇadvīpa (Sumatra), 158
Suvarnarekhā, river, 445
Suvarndrug, 634
Svāmidatta, 140
Svayamvara, practice of, 72, 190
Svetaketu, 40
Svetāmbara Jainas, 80, 81
Śvetāśvalara Upanishad, the, 193
Swadeshī movement, the, 888, 934, 968
Swarāj, 968, 971, 973
Swāt (Sawad), 190, 347, 447
Swedish East India Company, the, 625
Sydenham, Captain, 717
Syed Ahmad, 765
Syed Ahmad Khān, Sir, 842, 872, 885–6, 983
Sykes, Sir Percy, 894, 931
Sylhet, 981
Symes, Captain Michael, 723
Syria, 111, 129, 202, 203

Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī, the, 573
Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī, the, 280, 403
Tagara, 130
Tagdi, 366
Taghī, 319
Tagore, Abanindranāth, 948
Tagore, Devendranāth, 868, 869, 870
Tagore, Rabindranāth, 868, 946, 948
Tahmāsp, Shāh, 437, 525, 591
Taila I Chalukya, 170
Taila II, 170, 175, 180
Tailangas, the, 723
Tāj Khān, 429
Tāj Mahal, the, 481, 586, 589
Tāj-ud-dīn Fīrūz Shāh, *see* Fīūrz Shāh Bahmanī
Tāj-ud-dīn Yildiz, 271, 273, 275
Tāj-ul-Ma'āsir, 273
Tāj-ul-mulk, 330
Tājak, the, 573
Tājikas, the, 168
Taklamakan desert, 204
Tāl Sehonda, 464
Talamba, 328
Talara, the, 375
Talikota, battle of, 366
Talkhis, the, 402
Talmud, the, 474
Tālpurās, the, 753
Tamar, 283
Tamil country, the, 110, 182, 198, 374
—— districts, 379
—— literature, 371
—— people, 195, 196, 198
Tāmralipti, 76
Tāndā, 445
Tanjore, 110, 169, 170, 180, 242, 246, 500, 643, 644, 659, 712, 720, 747, 762, 804
——, Cholas of, 170
Tanjur, the Tibetan, 205
Tankā, the, 314–15
Tānsen, 591, 594
Tāntiā Topi, 766, 772
Tāntricism, 194, 246, 247
Tāptī, river, 348, 503
Tārā Bāī, 500, 517, 536, 540
Tarāī, the, 715
Tarāin, battle of, 270, 271, 275

Tārdī Beg, 439
Tarf, the, 511
Ta'rīkh-i-'Alāi, the, 294*n*, 403
Tarīkh-i-'Alfi, the, 573
Ta'rikh-i-Fīruz Shāhī, the, 271*n*, 311*n*, 403
Ta'rīkh-i-Jān Jahān, the, 572
Ta'rikh-i-Mubārak Shāhi, the, 309, 311*n*, 331, 403
Tarmāshīrīn Khān, 315, 316
Tartar Khān (Bahrām Khan,) 320, 335
Tartars, the, 191, 424, 548, 717
Tashi Lāmā, the, 895
Tashilhunpo, 895
Tashkhend, 825, 827
Tashkent Agreement, 1009
Tashkent Declaration (1966), 953, 1023, 1025
Tātār Khān (Nāsir-ud-dīn Muhammad Shāh), 345
Tathāgāta, 82
Tattah, 318, 322
Tattvabodhinī Patrikā, the, 868
Taltvabodhinī Sabhā, 868
Tavernier, Jean Baptiste, 566
Taxila, 62, 63, 65, 72, 77, 78, 94, 95, 103, 111, 124, 227, 946
Tayler, William, 769
Taylor, Meadows, 355, 358
Teg Bahādur, 493
Teheran, Treaty of, 744
Tej Singh, 736
Tejahpāla, 175, 195, 238
Telang, 312
Telang, K.T., 884
Telegaon, 670
Telegrāph system, the, 838, 841, 848 887
Telegu country, the, 165, 184, 360
—— literature, 371, 372, 377, 401
—— Reddis, 168
Telegu, sepoys, 865
Teliāgarhī, 430, 532
Telingana, 295, 297, 304, 318, 321, 326, 354, 358, 379, 470, 471, 509, 1020
Temple, Sir Richard, 741
Tenasserim, 723, 725, 831
Terry, Edward, 457, 458, 462, 480, 561, 563, 566, 567
Tezin, 752
Thais, the, 207
Thakkar, Amritlāl Vithaldās, 942
Thako Chak, 1014
Thākurīs, the (of Nepāl), 383
Thal, 897
Thana, 700
Thānesar, 144, 148, 149, 150, 173, 542
Tharrawaddy (Burmese king), 725, 726
Thatta, the, 320, 437, 753
Theosophical Society, 876–7, 938
Thibaw (Burmese king), 831, 832
Thomas, Edward, 272*n*, 276, 278*n*, 307*n*, 313–14, 320
Thomason, James, 796
Thornton, Edward, 680, 682, 702, 707, 712, 749
Thucydides, 444
Thugs, the, 819–20
Thun, 535
Tiastanes, 113
Tibet, 187, 205, 316, 383, 390, 799, 895–7, 987, 1006
Tibeto-Chinese, the, 723
Tickendrajit, 835
Tikka Khan, 1011, 1014
Tikta-vilva (Majapahit), 214
Tilak, Bāl Gangādhar, 884, 914, 968, 970
Tilpat, 294, 490
Tīmūr, 328, 329, 330, 334, 341, 342, 347, 389, 418, 419, 424, 450, 453, 467, 502, 541, 747
Tīmūr Shāh 'Ābbalī, 528, 728, 741
Tīmurīds, the, 142, 334, 419, 456, 483 501, 562, 573, 591; genealogical tables, 604, 605
Tinnevelly, 110, 683
Tipu Sultān, 671, 673, 674, 677–83 *passim*, 692, 704, 705, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 734, 783, 794
—— Shringerī letters of, 708
Tira, 830
Tirhut, 308, 333, 336, 341, 342
Tirthankaras, the, 81, 193, 194
Tīrujñāna-Sambandar, 196
Tirumāla (Āravīdu), 365, 367
Tiruvannāmalai, 362
Tissa Moggaliputta, 84
Tista, river, 715
Titto Meer (Meer Nisr 'Āli), 765
Tīvara, 102
Tobacco, 564
Tochi, 890
Tod, Colonel James, 270, 294, 380, 442, 444, 720
Todar Mall, 445, 447, 471, 554
Tomaras, the, 179
Tongol General, 835
Tonk, 699, 719, 720
Tonk, Nawāb of, *see* Amīr Khān
Tonkin, 832
Toramāna, 144, 146
Tori Khel rebellion, the, 891
Torna, 505
Torture, forms of, 324, 376

Tosali, 133
Trade and industry: in Vedic times, 34; Maurya era, 129–31; Vijayanagar Empire, 367–8; Turko-Afghān, 390; Mughul, 565–8, Modern India, 799–805, 886–9, 933–5, 954, 955, 956, 959, 960
Trade Unions, 937–8, 939, 956–7
Trade Unions Amendment Act, 1022
Trajan, 114
Transoxiana, 282, 315, 456, 524
Transport, 563
Travancore, 110, 365, 679, 983, 987, 991
—— University, 948
Trevelyan, Sir Charles, 812
Trevor, Captain, 749
Tribuvanamalla of Kalyān, 174
Tribuvanamalla Vikramāditya VI, 174
Trichinopoly, 110, 361, 500, 642, 643, 644, 659
Trilochan Dās, 575
Trilochanpāla, 173
Trimbak Rāo Dābhāde, 538
Trimbakjī Danglia, 700, 702
Trimurti, the, 25, 79
Trincomali, 676
Trinomali, 675
Triparadeisos, 93, 105
Tripāthī, 575
Tripoli, 953
Tripurā, 983, 989, 991
Triśala, 80
Tritsus, the, 26, 27, 28
Trombay, 964
Trotter, L. J., 746, 751
Tucker, H. St. G., 747
Tuen-sien, 207
Tughluq Shāh (Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq II), 327, 335
Tughluqābād, 308, 315
Tughluqnāmāh, the, 309
Tughluqs, the, 306–29, 335, 359, 386, 387, 389, 390, 407, 410, 448; genealogical table, 596
Tughril Khān, 283
Tukārām, 504, 871
Tukaroī, 445
Tukojī Holkar, 672, 674, 691
Tulsi Bāī, 699
Tulsī Dās, 575, 576
Tuluva dynasty, the, 362, 365; genealogical table, 602
Tungabhadrā, river, 166, 183, 359, 362, 510, 680
Turānīans, the, 447, 524
Turkestan, 270, 274, 357, 393, 418, 828, 987
——, Russian, 825, 987
Turki, 394, 424, 425, 481
Turki Shāhīya kings of Kābul, the, 171
Turkish slaves of Iltutmish, 271, 280
Turko-Afghān Government, the: Central Government, 384–8; Provincial, 388; Muslim nobility, 388–9; economic and social conditions, 389–93; literature, art and architecture, 393–415; Muslim education, 402–3
Turko-Afghāns, the, 360, 364, 379, 384–415, 418, 422, 524, 577
Turks, the, 175, 179, 268, 271, 274, 278, 279, 286, 288, 291, 334, 335, 352, 364, 366, 418, 424, 444, 488, 548, 730, 799, 891, 893, 894, 970, 971, 973. *See also* Turko-Afghāns
——, Ghaznavid, 180
——, Ilbari, 280, 287
——, Yamīnī, 174
Turlok, 1014
Turusha-danda, the 188
Turvaśas, the, 25, 26, 40
Tushāspha, 122

Uch, 269, 279, 317
Udabhāṇḍa, Shāhiya dynasty of, 172–4, 178, 180
Udabhāṇḍapura (Waihand), 155, 163, 171, 172, 173
Udai Singh, 442, 443
Udaipur, 584, 720, 761
Udaya, 381
Udayagiri, 193, 362, 363, 377
Udayana, 55, 58
Udāyi, 58, 59
Udaynalā, 664
Udbhaṭa, 155
Uddaṇḍapura, 160, 191
Udgīr, 541
Udita, 150
Udyotakara, 196
Ugrasena, 140
Ujjain, 55, 95, 113, 124, 142, 172, 276, 295, 312
Ulemas, the, 384, 385, 453
Ulghū, 289
Ulugh Khān, 291, 293, 295
Uma-Haimavatī, 78
Umar Khān Sarwānī, 428
Ummattūr, chief of, 363
Unemployment bureau, Fīrūz Shāh's, 325
United Company of Merchants, etc., *see* East India Company
United Indian Patriotic Association, 885

United Nations, 951, 952, 953, 966, 986, 988, 1007, 1009, 1023
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 966
United Provinces, the, 178, 194, 423, 796, 844, 861, 862, 873, 911, 932, 944, 966, 972, 985, 991, 993
United States, the, *see* America
Universities, India, 160, 815, 943–4, 945, 947, 948, 961–2
Upanishads, the, 43, 47, 51, 77, 79, 196, 399, 474, 572, 573
Uparika, the, 188
Upton, Colonel John, 669
Uraśā (Hazara), 62, 155
Urdu, 394, 395, 707, 945, 946, 1010
Urganj (Khiva), 488
Uruvilva, 82
Ush, 277
Ushas, 37
'Usmān Khān, 459
U.S., relations with India, 1027–9
U.S.S.R., 1009. *See also* Russia
Ustād 'Isā, 589
Ustād Mansūr, 592
Utpalas, the, 155
Uttar Pradesh, 991*n*
Uttarā Kurus, the, 53
Uttara Madras, the, 53
Uzbegs, the, 419, 447, 449, 467

Vāchaspati, 401
Vaijayantī, 109, 110, 165, 167
Vaijayantipura (Banavāsi), 164
Vainya Gupta, 144
Vaiśālī, kingdom of, 54, 57, 59, 84
Vaiśeshika, 401
Vaishṇava Āḻvārs, the, 167
Vaishṇava literature, 575–6
Vaishṇavas, *or* Bhāgavatas, the, 192
Vaishṇavism, 111, 132, 133, 134, 192, 193, 194, 196, 198, 372
Vaiśravaṇa, 78
Vaiśya caste, the, 27, 31, 44, 120, 125, 373
Vājapeya sacrifice, the, 31, 41, 192
Vajjian Confederacy, the, 140
Vākāṭakas, the, 110, 142, 164, 165
Vākpatirāja, 154, 200
Valabhī, 81, 150, 151, 153, 191, 195, 200
Valanādu, the, 188
Valikondāpuram, 635
Vallabhāchārya, 397, 575
Vālmiki, 86, 87
Vāman Pandit, 504
Vāmaṇa, 155
Vāmaṇa Bhatta Bāna, 401
Vanavāsi, 133
Vaṅga, 133, 156
Vaṅgas, the, 53–4, 87, 154
Vangiya Sāhitya Parisad, the, 962
Vansittart, Henry, 662, 663, 665
Varāha cave, the, 165
Varāhamihira, 142, 196, 200
Varuṇa, 24, 36, 46, 132, 184
Vasco da Gama, 346, 620
Vaśinī, 78
Vāsishka, 116
Vāsīshṭha, 26, 35
Vāsishṭhīputra Pulumāyi, 109
Vāsishṭhiputra Śātakarṇi, 109
Vastupāla, 175, 195
Vasubandhu, 194
Vāsudeva (Kṛishna-Devakīputra), 46, 78, 79, 87, 88, 89, 132, 133, 136, 198
Vāsudeva Kushān, 116, 134
Vāsudeva Śuṅga, 108
Vasumitra, 108
Vāta, 37
Vātapi, 149, 166, 167, 168, 198
Vatsa, 54, 55
Vatsarāja, 161, 169
Vātsāyana, 196
Vaṭṭagāmani Abhaya, 85
Vāya, 37
Veda, the, 22, 24–5, 47–50, 68, 83, 191, 195, 360, 868, 869, 873
Vedāṅgas, the, 51-2, 192
Vedānta, the, 196, 198, 394, 474
Vedic Age, early, 22–3; early Aryans, 24–7; political organisation, 27–30; Social life, 30–3; economic life, 32–4; arts and sciences, 35; religion, 36–8
——, the later: Aryan expansion, 39; administration, 41–3; social changes, 43–5; economic conditions, 45; religion, 46; literature and science, 47–52
Vedic civilisation and rites, 85, 192, 198–200, 874, 875
Vellore, 510, 642, 680, 705
Veṅgi, 140
Venice, 623
Venkata I (Venkatadri), 165
Venkata II, 367
Vepery, 635
Verelst, Harry, 570, 667, 802
Vernacular Press, the, 880
Versailles, 705
Viceroy, title of, 775
——, Council of the, 840, 843, 844, 845, 857, 978, 979, 980
Viceroy's Fund, 951
Victoria, Queen, 823, 837
——, Proclamation by, 775, 878
Vidagdha Madhava, the, 401

Vidarbhas, the, 39, 108
Videhas, the, 39, 40, 55, 87, 88
Vidhātṛi, 36, 37
Vidiśā, 107, 108, 111
Vidulā, 90
Vidyādhara, 174, 175–8
Vidyanath, 401
Vidyapati Thakur, 400
Vidyapati Upādhyāya, 401
Vidyāsāgar, Iswar Chandra, 877
Vietnam, 233, 241
Vigrahapāla I, 158
Vigrahapāla II, 158
Vigrahapāla III, 159
Vigraharāja IV, 179, 185
Viharās, the, 582
Vijaya (of Majapahit), 214
Vijaya-Bukka (Vīra Vijaya), 362
Vijaya Dev, 269
Vijaya Sen Surī, 451
Vijayadrug (Gheria), 634
Vijayanagar, 178, 182, 298, 317, 318, 350, 351, 352, 353, 355, 358, 359, 377, 395, 396, 401, 414, 415, 438, 448, 503, 591, 626, 630; political history, 359–67; splendour and wealth, 367–8; social life, 369–71; art and literature, 371–2; administration, 372–7; Yādavas, Tuluvas and Āravidus of, genealogical tables, 601–2
——City, 367-8
Vijayapura, 179
Vijayasona, 159, 179
Vijñānesvara, 181
Vikrama era (*Samvat*), 112
Vikramāditya, *or* new Sāhasāṅka, the, 174, 175, 178, 276
Vikramāditya I, 166, 168
Vikramāditya II, 166, 168, 200
Vikramāditya VI, 181, 195, 200
Vikramāditya Chandra Gupta II, *see* Chandra Gupta II
Vikramāditya Skanda Gupta, 143, 146, 148
Vikramāṅka Charita, the, 181, 201
Vikramāṅkadeva Charita, the, 181, 201
Vikramapura, 179
Vikramaśilā, 160, 191, 205
Vikramjit, Rājā (Hīmū), 396, 436, 439
Viktevitch, Russian envoy, 746
Village Assembly, the, 375, 853
Vima Kadphises, 114
Vimala, 195
Vimala Shā, 238
Vimala Vasahi, temple of, 175
Vimalasūri, 135
Vinayāditya, 156, 195
Vināyak Rāo, 693
Vināyakapāla, 162
Vindhya Hills, 198, 290, 499, 503
Vindhya Pradesh, 984, 991
Vinobaji, 1020
Vīra Ballāla II, 182
Vīra Ballāla III, 182, 295, 297, 318, 360
Vīra Ballāla IV, 318
Vīra Narasimha, 362
Vīra Pāndya, 297–8
Vīra Śaivas, the, 196
Vīra Vijaya (Vijaya-Bukka), 361
Vīrabhadra, Prince, 363
Vīradeva, 158
Vīradhavala Vāghela, 175
Vīraraja the younger, of Coorg, 758
Vīrasena-Sāba, 142, 200
Virupāksha III, 362
Viśākha, 78, 132
Viśavārā, 30
Vishayapati, the, 188
Vishnu, 36, 37, 46, 79, 88, 184, 193, 194, 198, 200, 233, 370, 397
Vishṇu Gupta, 144, 154
Vishṇu Urukrama, 37
Vishṇugopa, 140, 165
Vishṇukuṇḍin family, the, 148, 164, 165
Vishṇuvardhana, 182
Vishṭi, 187
Vishwās Rāo, 542, 545
Viśishṭadvaita, 198
Visva-Bharati, 963
Viśvakarmā cave, the, 244
Viśvakarman, 36, 38
Viśvāmitra, 28, 35
Viśvarūpa Sena, 180
Viśveśvara, 396
Vītapāla, 160
Vital Nāth, 575
Vithujī Holkar, 693
Viṭṭhalasvāmī temple, the, 366, 372
Vivekananda, Svāmī, 874–6
Vizagapatam, 363, 954
Vonones, 112
Vrātyas, the, 44, 54, 56
Vṛichīvats, the, 25, 26
Vṛiji (Vajji), 54
Vṛijian Sate, the, 54–5, 57, 58
Vyāghradeva, 164
Vyāghrarāja, 164
Vyāsa, 86

Wade, Sir Claude M., 747
Wadgāon, Convention of, 670
Wadia, B.P., 937
Wahhābīs, the, 767, 884
Waihand (Udabhāṇḍapur), 155, 163, 171, 173

Waingangā, river, 350
Wajang, 215
Wakil-i-mutluq, the, 672
Waltair, 943
Wandīwāsh, 660, 708
Wang-hiuen-tse, 138, 153
Wāqa-i-navis, the, 551
Waqiāt-i-Bāburī, the, 573
Waqiāt-i-Jahāngīrī, the, 456
Wangchuk, Jigme Singye, 897
Warangal, 181, 295, 296, 297, 307, 308, 317, 318, 350, 351, 352, 358, 359, 360
Warda, river, 696, 697
Wardak, 116
Wardha system, 962
Washington Conference, 1026
Washington, U.S.A., 936, 952, 966
Wasil Muhammad, 717, 718,
Watson, Admiral Charles, 541, 634, 652, 653, 657, 658
Watts, W., 648
Wavell, Lord, 978, 980
Wāzir, the, 385, 386, 550
Wāzir ʿĀlī, 689, 713, 742
Wazir Khān, 534
Wāziristān, 890, 891
Wellesley, Arthur (Duke of Wellington), 694, 695, 697, 708, 711, 747, 753
Wellesley, Marquess, 512, 671, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 697, 698, 705, 706, 707, 709–14 *passim*, 720, 742, 757, 762, 818, 833, 837
Wellington, Duke of, *see* Wellesley, Arthur
West Asia, 1029
West Bengal, 991, 993
West Pakistān, 1010, 1012
Western Ghats, 505
Wheeler, Sir Hugh, 770
Whitley, Rt. Hon. J.H., 936
Widow re-marriage, 30, 71, 579, 766, 807, 870, 871, 872, 877, 940
Widows, burning of, 197. *See also Sati*
Wilks Colonel Mark, 677, 678
Williams, Rushbrook, 422, 805
Williamson, Mr., 898
Willingdon College, Sangli, 877
Willoughby, Lieut., 768
Wilson, Sir Archdale, 771
Wilson, Dr. H.H., 714
Windham, Sir Charles Ash, 772
Women, position of: in Vedic Age, 30, 43; Magadhan era, 71; Maurya era, 125; Gupta era, 189; Vijayanagar Empire, 369, 370; Turko-Afghan era, 393; Mughul era, 572; early 19th century, 807; Modern India, 940–2, 945, 966
Women's University, Indian, 943, 945
Wood, Benjamin, 628
Wood, Sir Charles (Lord Halifax), 813, 842
Wood, General J.S., 715
Woodhead, Sir John, 958
Workmen's Compensation Act (1946), 957, 1021
World Trade Union Conference (1945) 952
World War I, 891, 892, 894, 895, 903, 912, 916, 922, 933, 934, 937, 943, 970
World War II, 949–51, 954, 956, 958, 976
Wright, R., 930
Wynaad, 707
Wynn, Charles W. W., 808

Xenophon, 441
Xerxes, 62

Yādavas, the, 89, 90, 168, 180, 181, 182, 191, 201, 295, 296, 304, 503, 505; genealogical table, 601
Yadus, the, 25, 26
Yahiyā-bin-Ahmad, 307, 315, 322, 324, 325, 403
Yahiyā-bin-Ahmad Sārhindi, 305, 308, 331
Yahya Khān, 1011, 1013, 1026, 1028
Yājñavalkya, 40
Yajurveda, the, 50
Yaksha cult, the, 78
Yaʿkūb (son of Sher ʿĀlī), 828
Yama, 38, 184
Yaman, 488
Yaminī Turks, the, 174
Yāmunāchārya, 198
Yanam, 999
Yandāboo, 725, 726
Yaʿqub (of Kāshmīr), 447
Yaʿqūb-ibn-Lais, 267
Yāqūt, 278
Yāśaskara, 155, 184
Yāska, 52
Yaśodā, 80
Yaśodharā, 82
Yaśodharapura (Angkor Thom), 210
Yaśodharman, 144, 147, 148, 196
Yaśovarman (of Kambuja), 207–10
Yasovarman (of Kanauj), 145, 153, 154, 157, 161, 201
Yatung, 896
Yaudheyas, the, 140
Yauvanaśrī, 159
Yavanas (Greeks), 63, 66, 74, 90, 93, 108, 109, 120, 125, 133, 134, 135,
Yen-kao-chen, 114, 115

Yildiz, Tāj-ud-dīn, 271, 273, 275
Yoga, 394, 401
Yoga Vasiṣhṭha Rāmayana, the, 572,
Yonas, the, 95
Younghusband, Sir Francis, 895, 896
Yudhishṭhira, 88, 89
Yue-chis, the, 112, 113–14, 133, 137
Yunnan, 834, 898
Yūsuf ʿĀdil Khān, 357
Yūsuf ʿĀdil Shāh (of Bijāpur), 395, 498
Yūsuf Shāh (Shama-ud-dīn Abul Muzaffar Yūsuf Shāh), 337
Yūsuf Shāh (of Kāshmīr), 447
Yūsufzāis, the, 447, 487
Yuvaraj Karan Singh, 988

Zābul, 171
Zafar Khān (of Bengal), 321, 326
Zafar Khān (of Gujarāt), 304, 329, 345
Zafar Khān (Khaljī minister), 291, 292, 302
Zafar Khān Hasan (Ālā-ud-dīn Hassan Bahman Shāh), 318, 349, 350, 351
Zafarābād, 317, 321
Zain-ul ʿĀbidīn, 347, 394, 395
Zakariyā Khān, 525
Zakāt, the, 323
Zakka Khel, the, 891
Zālim, the, 353
Zalim Singh, 720
Zamān Shāh, 692, 708, 713, 729, 741, 742, 743
Zamāniā, 445
Zamindārs, the, 423, 784–93 *passim*, 795, 809, 926
Zaranj, 171
Zeb-un-Nisā, 572, 573
Zeus Ombrios, 132
Zia-ur Rahman, 1018
Ziauddin Khān, 1011
Zilā Courts, the, 791, 796
Zindā Pīr, the, 489
Zoological Survey of India, the, 947
Zoroastrians, the, 452, 454, 463, 939
Zubd-ut-Tawārīkh, the, 574
Zulfikār Pass, 829
Zu'lfiqār Khān, 517, 520, 521, 524, 536

An Advanced History of India

Originally published in 1946, *An Advanced History of India* at once established itself as the standard work on the subject. The present edition brings the history up to 1978.

The detailed record of events is supplemented throughout by a careful study of administrative, social, economic and cultural developments. A close scrutiny of original sources has produced a clear and full picture of Indian civilisation.

Adequately provided with genealogical tables, bibliography, illustrations, maps and plans.

ISBN 0333-90298-X

9 780333 902981

Rs. 445.00

MACMILLAN
Macmillan Publishers India Ltd
www.macmillanindia.com

0010

P6-BKV-997